VIII. — *Plautine Synizesis. A Study of the Phenomena of Brevis Coalescens.*[1]

BY PROF. ROBERT S. RADFORD,

ELMIRA COLLEGE.

THE purpose of the present paper is, first, assuming the real existence of Plautine synizesis, to indicate more clearly, through a discussion of syllable values, its probable nature; secondly, to establish the fact of its actual existence, if possible, to the exclusion of any other hypothesis; thirdly, to investigate the laws and limitations to which it is subject. In view of the doubts which have prevailed in some quarters upon the subject of early Latin synizesis, this may seem to some too large an undertaking, but, fortunately, it will not be necessary for me to discuss these questions in reliance upon my own unaided resources. Many Plautine scholars have made just and careful observations upon this general subject, and even those who have advocated erroneous views, notably Müller and Skutsch, have often contributed something of real value to the discussion. Hence it will be my task chiefly to collect and to harmonize the important single facts which my predecessors in this field have already pointed out.[2]

[1] *D. M. et perpetuae memoriae GUILELMI ELISHAE PETERS, praeceptoris sui carissimi in Universitate Virginiensi, viri in fabulis Plautinis maxime versati sacrum esse voluit pientissimus auctor.*

[2] Bibliography: Ritschl, *Proleg.* cap. xii; Spengel, *Einleitung zu Andria*, § 8; C. F. W. Müller, *Plaut. Pros.* 456 ff.; L. Müller, *Res Metr.*[2] lib. iv (279 ff.); Leppermann, *De correptione iamb. ap. Pl.*, Münster, 1890 (unfortunately, L.'s statistics upon synizesis and non-synizesis forms are in part extremely inaccurate); Bömer, *De correptione iamb. Terent.*, Münster, 1891 (a careful dissertation); Abraham, *Stud. Plaut., Neue Jahrb. f. Phil.* XIV, 204 f.; Nilsson, *Quomodo pronomina, quae cum subst. coniunguntur, ap. Pl. collocentur*, Lund, 1901; Leo, *Plaut. Forsch.* 323; Havet, *De Saturnio*, 32, 79 f.; Gleditsch, *Metr.*[3] 258, 295; Skutsch, *Sat. Viadr.* 135 ff.; Audouin, *De Plaut. anapaestis*, Paris, 1898, p. 69 f., 121, 228; Ahlberg, *De proceleusmaticis antiquae poesis Lat.* I, 85 ff.; Lindsay, *Introduction to the Captivi*, 26 ff.; Neue, II[3], 366 ff., 377 ff., etc.; Thurneysen, *K.Z.* XXX, 499 f.; Bronisch, *Die oskischen i- und e- Vocale*,

I. Quantitative Value of Syllables. Character of Plautine Synizesis.

That the prosody of Plautus is different in many respects from the prosody of the Augustan poets, is universally admitted to be true, yet, in spite of our earnest efforts to draw a clear line of demarcation between the usage of the earlier and that of the later period, we are in constant danger of bringing to the study of Plautine verse a set of conceptions based upon the familiar Augustan prosody, and a vocabulary of metrical terms unconsciously colored by their adaptation to the Augustan use. This traditional vocabulary, which we are under the necessity of using, is often also quite inadequate and quite inexact, and, in view of the unfortunate associations with which some of these terms are almost indissolubly connected, their use often increases our perplexity and embarrassment. No one of the ancient metrical phenomena seems to me more inadequately named than that which I propose to discuss in the present paper, viz. early Latin synizesis, since the term 'synizesis,' as is well known, is employed in several quite different senses and is often applied to quite disparate phenomena; before I enter fully upon the discussion of this question, however, it will be best to give another and an even more striking illustration of the inadequacy of our common metrical terms as applied to Plautine prosody.

The Problem of Ille. — It is important to recognize that the *system* of quantitative measurements employed by Plautus is different in several respects from the quantitative system of Augustan poetry. I do not mean to imply by this that either one of the two systems is less good or less genuine than the other; on the contrary, both systems seem to me to be based as a whole upon the most genuine and substantial foundation possible, viz. a definite and original sense of quantity on the

Leipzig, 1892; Sturtevant, *Contraction in the Case Forms of deus, is, and idem,* Chicago, 1902; Engelbrecht, *Wien. Stud.* VI, 236 ff.; Brock, *Quaest. gramm.,* Dorpat, 1897; Hodgman, *Harvard Studies,* IX, 151 f.; Christ, *Metr.*[2] 30 ff.; Corssen, *Ausspr.* II[2], 744 ff.; Skutsch, Γέρας, Göttingen, 1903, p. 108 ff.; etc.

part of those who used the Roman language.[1]   But I mean
that the two systems differ somewhat in the solution of cer-
tain practical problems of exact measurement, such as must
confront every form of quantitative speech.   An apt illus-
tration of this fact is afforded, as it seems to me, by the
treatment in Plautus of those dissyllabic pronouns and con-
junctions, which, according to the grammarians, are without
the "high tone" (*fastigium,* cf. Keil, VII, 360, 10), viz.
ille, inde, immo, nempe, etc.   As is well known, *ille* not only
has the value of three morae ($\_ \cup$) in Plautus, but also at
times the value of two morae ($\cup \cup$), but Skutsch has shown
in his *Plaut. Forsch.* that the latter value belongs to the pro-
noun, only when it is dissyllabic and does not suffer elision
of the final syllable; monosyllabic *ill*[*e*], *ill*[*a*], etc., have
invariably the value of two morae ($\_$).   In view of these
facts, Skutsch maintains that the conclusion is certain that
the ultima of *ille, immo, nempe,* etc., was often totally sup-
pressed by syncope in the rapid pronunciation of colloquial
speech, and he offers us the following "mathematical demon-
stration" of the correctness of this view (*Plaut. Forsch.*
40) : —

Nempe before consonants has the value of   .   .   2 morae
The first syllable has the value of   .   .   .   .   .   2 morae

The second syllable has the value of   .   .   .   .   0 mora

Such a solution of the problem appears at first sight most
attractive, and, in the case of *nempe,* it has been accepted
as a correct solution by a very large number of Plautine
scholars; yet, in my judgment, the proposed solution is very
far from being really convincing.   Since, however, I propose
to discuss the question of these pronouns more fully else-
where, only the general character of my criticism need be
indicated here.[2]   Professor Skutsch's argument appears to

---

[1] Cf. *Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc.* XXXV, 50 f.; *A.J.P.* XXV, 425 ff.

[2] For this reason I do not dwell here upon the fact that many other pronouns,
such as *nēquis, nēqua, quisquis, hocin, omnis,* etc., should be added to the list
given by Skutsch, nor upon the fact that the pronominal word-orders cannot be
easily changed for the colloquial language, and hence would quickly develop

me to involve two very doubtful assumptions: (1) The assumption that the syllable *nemp* has precisely the same value and the same pronunciation, whether it belongs to the dissyllable *nempe*, or to the monosyllable *nemp[e]*. Such a supposition would be obviously incorrect, for example, if applied to the English sentence; for in our own language the dissyllable *manly* and the monosyllable *man* have quite different relations to accent and quantity (cf. Dabney, *Musical Basis of Verse*, 32). (2) The assumption that, in the verse of Plautus (which closely conforms to actual speech), all of the syllables can be properly divided into those of one, and those of two morae respectively.

This last consideration is a fundamental one, and has to do with the essential difference which exists between Plautine and Augustan prosody. For, however regular the usage of the Augustan poets may be, it is not certain that, in the earlier period, either one of the syllables of *nempe* had normal value. Thus final short syllables, especially final syllables in *-e*, may well be shorter in many cases than the normal short, as is shown by the fact that they suffer actual syncope in a limited number of cases, and in many cases they are treated, by preference, with elision (Langen, *Philol.* XLVI (1887), 419; Lindsay, *L.L.* 203). It is even more certain that the long penult of toneless pronouns and conjunctions is shorter than the normal long of a penultimate syllable. Let us suppose then that the penultimate syllable of *nempe* has the value of $1\frac{2}{3}$ morae, instead of 2 morae, and that the ultima has the value of $\frac{2}{3}$ of a mora, instead of 1 mora. Would not these assumed values account equally well for the metrical usage of Plautus? The dissyllable *nempe*, which would really have the value of $2\frac{1}{3}$ morae, could still be always treated as two shorts, and the monosyllable *nemp[e]*, which would really be worth only $1\frac{2}{3}$ morae, would still constitute, in actual usage, a long. And even if this explanation should be rejected for the single word *nempe*, it is evident

the use of any metrical license for which a genuine ground once existed. Further, in any complete discussion, the question would arise why the supposed syncope does not apply to all well-worn words alike, such as *esse, saepe, curre*, etc.

that it would remain highly probable for *ille, inde, immo, nēquis,* etc.

It may perhaps be said that, in this discussion of the value of *nempe,* we are taking refuge in mere verbal quibbles, and that all syllables have, in practice, the value either of one or of two morae. On the contrary, the assumption that early Latin prosody had definitely accepted a sharp division of syllables into those of one and of two morae, is not only, in my judgment, wholly unwarranted, since so rigid a scheme of the syllables confessedly involves many artificial and adventitious elements (cf., for example, Victor Henry, *Comp. Gramm.,* Engl. transl., 85), but is also distinctly negatived by the extensive phenomena of the Iambic Law. As is well known, this question of syllable values was discussed by the ancient theorists, and gave rise to a division into two schools. One of the two schools, it is true, the *metrici,* recognized only long and short syllables, that is, syllables of one and two times, but the more scientific school, founded by Aristoxenus and called the *rhythmici* (or *musici*), held that many both of the long and of the short syllables differed from each other in quantity, and they expressly recognized in speech *syllabae longis longiores,* syllables longer than the long, and *syllabae brevibus breviores,* syllables shorter than the short. Cf. Marius Victorinus, i, 8: nam musici non omnes inter se longas aut breves pari mensura consistere, siquidem et *brevi breviorem* et *longa longiorem* dicant posse syllabam fieri. metrici autem, . . . neque breviorem aut longiorem, quam natura in syllabarum enuntiatione protulerit, posse aliquam reperiri.[1] No doubt it is true that, apart from the phenomena of elision[2] and from the occasional cases of *natural* synizesis

---

[1] Cf. Quint. ix, 4, 84, and for a collection of numerous other references to the doctrine of the *rhythmici, v.* Goodell, *Chapters in Greek Metric,* 6 f., and Christ, *Metr.*[2] 77 f.

[2] The elided syllables (so called) were in nearly all cases too short to be definitely measured or to be taken into account metrically, but no one supposes that they were always completely expelled, and were always left entirely unpronounced; at least, this was not the case with Roman elision. Hence we may safely assert that, even if it were necessary to explain the final syllable of *nempe* — the one word — as neglected in the metre, it would not certainly follow that

in Greek (*v.* p. 167), this doctrine of the *rhythmici* is not of such manifest practical importance in Greek poetry, but it is of the greatest practical importance in early Latin versification; for the early dramatic poets, as is now generally recognized, composed primarily by their ear, and according to their general rhythmical feeling, rather than in obedience to a body of precise metrical rules. Their language, it is true, was quantitative, and the weak expiratory accent which it possessed was a wholly insufficient basis for verse, yet this language had not yet fully adapted itself to the somewhat conventional measurements of quantity prescribed by the *metrici.* Hence, whatever favorite phrase or formula we may adopt, whether we choose to call it "Law of Iambic Shortening," or employ some other name, it is always in reality and in the last analysis the doctrine of the *rhythmici* which we invoke. This fact has been made fairly plain by W. Christ in his extended article, *Die Gesetze der plautinischen Prosodie, Rhein. Mus.* XXIII (1868), 559 ff.; and, although many forms of statement employed by Christ in 1868 are now inadmissible, and many of his suppositions are quite untenable in the light of more recent study, yet the rhythmical doctrine to which he appeals still remains highly instructive and substantially correct.

We may then justly claim that the spoken language of Plautus's time possessed syllables which cannot be properly assigned the exact value either of one mora or of two, and without attempting to be over-precise, we may, for the purpose of convenient classification, distinguish the following four classes of syllables: I. 'Heavy' longs (*syllabae longis longiores*), *i.e.* those long syllables which (except in the first foot of a hemistich) are rarely shortened in dialogue metres through the agency of the Iambic Law, — in other words, those syllables of substantives, verbs, and many adverbs which bear the primary tone; cf. also syllables other than final, which contain a diphthong or naturally long vowel, etc.

it was wholly suppressed in pronunciation, and in this way suffered absolute syncope. According to metrical theory, such an assumption would not be necessary; see below, p. 164 f.

II. Long syllables which are lighter in various degrees than the foregoing, and which are often shortened by the Iambic Law, — in other words, unaccented long syllables, including the long penultimate syllables of conjunctions, prepositions, and pronouns. (For the frequent shortening of the latter, see Ahlberg, *De corrept. iamb.* 66 ff.) III. Short syllables of normal value. IV. Exceptionally short and rapid syllables, which have less than the value of one mora, including those which are diminished in value almost to the point of vanishing (*syllabae brevibus breviores*). This last class is of special importance for the purposes of the present study, and hence requires more detailed discussion.

Syllables of Diminishing Value. — In general, there are very many diminishing syllables in Plautus, some initial, some medial, and some final, which are at least as rapid and as fugitive as the final syllable of *nempe*. Thus Leo has shown (*Forsch.* 267 ff.) that the final syllables of *enim, nimis, satis, magis, potis* are exceptionally weak and very rarely placed under the metrical accent, cf. the monosyllabic forms *sat, pot(e), mag(e)*; still earlier Schrader had shown in his well-known study (*De partic. -ne prosodia*, 30 f.) that the final syllable of *potin* is never placed under the ictus, that of *satin* very rarely, and so on. Again, we may illustrate this weakness chiefly from medial syllables. The Plautine language possesses the doublets *purigo* and *purgo, iurigo* and *iurgo, creduas* and *credas, mavolo* and *malo, spreverit* and *sprerit, audiverat* and *audierat, cognoverit* and *cognorit, face* and *fac, siet* and *sit, laudarier* and *laudari, dextera* and *dextra, periculum* and *periclum.*[1] We may freely admit that in Plautus these are, for the most part, actual doublets; yet it is evident that,

---

[1] This list includes doublets of two kinds, first, those like *iurigo* and *iurgo, cognoverit* and *cognorit*, in which the shorter forms are actually derived from the longer; and secondly, those like *periculum* and *periclum, creduas* and *credas, siet* and *sit, laudarier* and *laudari*, in which the two forms are independent of each other and possess a different origin. Only the first class of cases is strictly pertinent here, but, for convenience, I have enumerated as doublets all the related word-forms which were at the disposal of the poet. For an example of *voverat* actually written for *vôrat* (Saturnian verse-close), see *CIL.* I, 541, 7, and cf. Havet, *De Sat.* 236.

shortly before this time and even during the whole Plautine period, such shortened forms as *cognorim* or *purgo* still retained very largely in actual speech the diminishing syllable (*e.g. cogno*ᵛᵉ*rim*), — a syllable having the value perhaps of one half or one fourth of a mora. Moreover, the usage of Terence shows that many of these weak syllables (especially when a long vowel preceded, cf. Spengel on *Ad.* 304; Schrader, *l.l.*, 13 ff.) had diminished still further by his time; for Terence is here somewhat more strict than Plautus, and, in general, knows only the forms *cognorim, malo, fac, laudari*, etc.; in only one position in the verse does he admit the use of the long forms *sprēverit, amāverat, face, siet, laudarier, dextera, perīculum*, viz. in the verse-close,[1] and it is evident that in this position he is strongly influenced by metrical convenience or necessity.[2] In other words, so great is the demand in the final foot for iambic words and for words ending in an iambus that, in this place, the poet assigns, *and the reader expects him to assign*, the value of a full mora to syllables which are too short to be often counted at all elsewhere (for additional examples, see below, p. 179). This license is justified, however, by the fact that it rests upon a *metrical convention* which is thoroughly well known to the reader, and it is possibly also somewhat relieved by the further fact that all quantities, both long and short, tend to be heard more distinctly in the verse-close than elsewhere (cf. in part, Cic. *de Or.* iii, 50, 192).[3]

The ancient rhythmical theory of extraordinary short and fugitive syllables applies of course equally well to the verse of other than the classical nations. Thus, in our English accentual poetry we often find the light second vowel sup-

---

[1] Cf. Engelbrecht, *Stud. Terent.* 76 ff.; Stange, *De archaismis Terent.* 33 f.; Lindsay, *Class. Rev.* VI, 87 ff.; Brock, *l.l.*, 75 ff.

[2] Cf. Lindsay, *Class. Rev.* VI, 89: "In other words, Plautus tends to treat the use of the expanded forms (*periculum, poculum*, etc.) as a license, only to be resorted to in cases of metrical necessity."

[3] Cf. Ramain, *Études sur les Groupes de Mots*, Paris, 1904, p. 202: "Les doubles formes, lexicologiques ou prosodiques, ne sont pas usitées indifféremment : c'est ainsi que *evenat, siet, fŭerit* sont reservées exclusivement pour le dernier pied." Cf. also Exon, *Hermathena*, XIII, 568.

pressed in such dissyllables as *never* (written also *nev'r*), *seven* (*sev'n*), *heaven, power,* etc., and in Shakespere also in *jewel, being, seeing, playing,* cf. also *trav(e)lled, rememb(e)red, threat-(e)ned* (Abbott, *Shakespearian Gramm.,* § 470); conversely, Shakespere sometimes pronounced as dissyllables some of our present monosyllabic words, such as *fire* (written also *fier*), *dear, fear, hour* (*ib.,* § 480). A close parallel to the Teren-tian usage of *mĕō, amavĕrat, pericŭlum* is afforded by the termination *-tion,* which is rarely dissyllabic in the middle of a line, but is frequently so treated at the end of a line (*ib.,* § 479), *e.g.:*

> That shall make answer to such ques*tions.*
>
> > *2 Hen. VI,* i, 2, 80.
>
> These three lead on this prepara*tion.*
>
> > *Cor.,* i, 2, 15
>
> But
>
> I'll raise the prepara*tion* of a war.
>
> > *Ant.,* iii, 4, 26.

Compare also the negligible syllables in the following lines from *Hamlet:*

Ay, thou poor ghost, while mem(o)ry holds a seat, i, 5, 96; And leads the will to desp(e)rate undertakings, ii, 1, 104; Remorseless, treach(e)rous, lech(e)rous, kindless villain, ii, 2, 609; The undis-cov(e)red country from whose bourn, iii, 1, 79; And with the incor-p(o)ral air do hold discourse, iii, 4, 118.

Synizesis. — Apart from the phenomena of elision, the most perfect illustration of the occurrence of negligible syllables in O. Lat. is afforded by those cases in which two contiguous vowels, belonging to different syllables, are pronounced in immediate succession either in the same word, or in case of elision, in two different words, *e.g. mĕō, meam ūxorem.*[1] Quite similar are the cases where the two vowels belong to differ-

---

[1] The second case is of course usually termed *synaloepha* (so-called elision), but it would be a faulty and pedantic analysis that would admit in the present case any difference of principle between the two examples cited above; see below, pp. 178, 202 f. Besides, the best authorities, both ancient and modern, do not attempt to distinguish sharply between *synizesis* and *synaloepha;* cf. Hephaes-tion, p. 10 W; Scholia A, p. 120 W.; L. Müller, *K.M.*[2] 279 ff.

ent and originally independent parts of a compound, as in
coērce, coēmisse, coēgi, deōsculer, dehŏrtări, prehēndo, etc. (cf.
Klotz, *Grundz.* 140; C. F. W. Müller, *Pl. Pros.* 451 ff.[1]).
These phenomena are usually grouped under the name of
synizesis, but as I have already pointed out (p. 159), the use
of this name cannot be considered fortunate. To classical
scholars the term 'synizesis' is chiefly associated with cer-
tain poetical artifices, certain metrical licenses, which dactylic
poets like Homer and Vergil have freely used in order to
adapt words of a difficult kind — especially cretic words like
ναυτέων or *aurcis* — to the exigencies of the hexameter verse,
and, although the ancients sometimes defined the term natu-
rally and scientifically — as, for example, Scholia A upon
Hephaestion, p. 119 W., where it is implied that, in θοί for
θεοί, the ε is *naturally* so weak as to be scarcely audible —
yet the artificial sense has always predominated in the use
of the term; cf. Christ, *Metr.*[2] 28, § 37.[2] Hence there
can be little ground for wonder that so conscientious a
student of Plautus as C. F. W. Müller has put it on record
(*Pl. Pros.* 456, n. 1) that he considered *all* Roman synizesis
artificial and of Greek origin, and there can be little doubt
that he was largely led by this view of the subject to substi-
tute iambic shortening as an explanation for all supposed
cases of synizesis in Plautus. Before we undertake, then,
to prove the reality of Plautine synizesis or to explain its
laws, we must clearly differentiate this synizesis of the living
speech and of the preferred rhythm from certain other phe-
nomena which possess a wholly different character, and owe
their origin to a widely different line of development.

A. The phenomena which we propose to discuss are quite
different from the synizesis of Greek origin (*Synizesis Grae-*

---

[1] Here, as in every other part of the present subject, authorities differ about
the proper *name* for the phenomena. C. F. W. Müller, for example, rejects ‚the
term 'synizesis,' and compares the method of procedure to elision between inde-
pendent words.

[2] In the passage of Scholia A cited above, the natural and artificial elements
are strangely mixed, *e.g.* τὰς κακομετρίας ἀφαιρεῖ τῶν στίχων (*artificial*) . . .
δισύλλαβον ὑποκλέψασα (*natural*) διὰ τὴν χρείαν (*artificial*) . . . καὶ γέγονε θοι
τρόπον τινά (*natural*).

canica, L. Müller, *R.M.*[2] 283, 325 ff.), which was first introduced by Catullus and his contemporaries into Roman epic
poetry, and which may best be illustrated by the familiar
Vergilian examples *aureîs* (*Aen.* i, 726), *alveô* (*ib.*, vi, 412),
Eurystheô (*ib.*, viii, 292). I may point out just here, by way
of anticipation, one important and striking difference which
exists between Vergilian and O. Lat. synizesis. The latter
is chiefly connected with the weakening of an *initial* syllable
in words which begin with an iambus, *e.g.* (*e*)*ōs*, (*e*)*āmus*,
t(*u*)*ām-rem* (but cf. *exĕámus*, *aúreŏ*), while the former assumes
the weakening of a *medial* syllable in polysyllabic words,
e.g. aureô. This treatment of the initial syllable of iambic
words in O. Lat. is probably to be explained on the well-
known principle of *the preferred rhythm of a language;* in
other words, the ear of the Roman people originally preferred
the fierce energy (γοργότης) of the trochaic rhythm to the
comparative tameness of the iambic movement, and this
national preference for the trochaic rhythm made itself felt
in word-forms, wherever the conditions were otherwise favorable, as in (*e*)*ámus*, *exĕámus*, *ádfŭìt*, *aúrĕŏ*, etc. Greek synizesis, on the other hand, although doing no actual violence
to this principle, does nothing to promote it, and hence stands
in no close relation to distinctive Roman tendencies or the
cadences of Roman speech. Yet widely as the Greek and
the Roman forms of synizesis differ in these respects, they
are both subject at certain points to the same limitations (see
p. 202).

   B. The phenomena which we discuss are wholly different
in character from the treatment of vowel *i* and vowel *u* as
consonant *i* and consonant *u* respectively, in such a way as to
make the preceding short syllable long by position, *e.g. āvyum*
(Enn. *Ann.* 91 M.), *insīdyantes* (*ib.*, 443 M.), *ābyete* (Verg.
Aen. ii, 16), *tēnvia* (*id.*, *Geor.* ii, 121), *consīly*[*um*] (Hor. *C.*
iii, 4, 41); for other examples, see L. Müller, *R.M.*[2] 299 ff. ;
Christ, *Metr.*[2] 32. According to L. Müller (*l.l.*, 283, 301),
this hardening of *i* and *u* is confined to epic and lyric poetry,
where it is due almost wholly to metrical necessity (*extrema
necessitate*), and its use was never admitted in Latin iambic

and trochaic metres.   In fact, as many metricians recognize, this phenomenon is not, properly speaking, synizesis at all, and it is not subject to the strict laws which we shall find always observed in Plautine synizesis (p. 178).

The consonantization of vowel *i* and vowel *u*, as we have seen, is wholly unknown to Latin iambic verse.   An entirely different treatment of these weak vowels is occasionally found both in O. Lat. iambic and dactylic verse, and consists in their total suppression (so far as concerns the metre), in cases where they stand in inner hiatus.   This usage is rare, but is thoroughly well attested, and, unlike synizesis, it is subject to no special restrictions.   Examples are : *evenat, advenat, pervenat,* etc. (Pl.), *monerim* (Pacuv.), *augura* (Accius), *progen(i)e[m]* (*CIL.* I, 38), *or(i)undi* (Lucr.), *oper(i)untur* (Laevius); see L. Müller, *R.M.*[2] 289 f. ; Christ, *Metr.*[2] 32 ; Klotz, *Grundz.* 140; Lindsay, *L.L.* 465, 506.[1]   For a similar use in Greek poetry, cf. Christ, *Metr.*[2] 30, 29; L. Müller, *l.l.,* 289.   Under this head belong also the very rare cases in Plautus of trisyllabic *me[ō] ănimo, su[o] ăliquem* cited below (p. 203).   Cf. also Pl. *Per.* 100 :

Terréstris té c(o)ĕpulónus cómpellát tuós.[2]
       2   3

We have seen that both the synizesis which is imitated from Greek usage and the hardening of *i* and *u* are artistic devices which are employed to introduce difficult words into special kinds of verse.   The question remains whether there was, in such word-forms as were named above (*meō, meăm, eō,* etc.), a *natural* synizesis characterizing the living speech, and somewhat similar to the pronunciation which is almost

---

[1] Most of these forms are well attested, but Plautine *evenat, pervenat,* have little Ms authority, and are sharply called in question by Exon, *Hermathena,* XIII, 138 f.   The suppression of vowel *i* in these forms also seems, however, the most probable solution.   A different explanation is possible also for some of the other examples cited above ; a case of suppression that should be added to the list is *periero,* which, according to Professor Warren's probable derivation in *Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc.* XXXII, 112 f., represents *periuero* (reduced from *periovero*); cf. Walde's *Lexicon* (appendix), which accepts this explanation in part.

[2] A numeral placed *below* the line denotes a foot of *iambic* verse ; *in* the line, a foot of *trochaic* verse.

universally admitted as the normal and regular one for $\widehat{dein}$, $de\widehat{i}nde$, $pro\widehat{i}nde$, $pro\widehat{u}t$, $quo\widehat{a}d$, $de\widehat{h}inc$, etc.[1] In spite of the objections raised by some Plautine scholars, such as C. F. W. Müller, Havet, and Skutsch, I believe it certain that there was in many such word-forms[2] a weakly uttered syllable in hiatus, which, in comparison with the much longer adjacent syllable, appeared to diminish greatly and to fall sensibly below the value of a mora. It was therefore nearly always neglected in the middle of a verse, and was freely allowed the value of a mora only through the conventions of the verse-close. This so-called synizesis occurs in connection with the short vowels *e*, *i*, and *u*, all three of which (especially *i* and *u*) readily tend to assume a semi-vocalic character.[3] Yet in the O. Lat. phenomena these vowels have not become consonants, but remain slight and weakly uttered vowel sounds. This appears from the fact that elision con-

---

[1] C. F. W. Müller (*l.l.*, 451), as has already been noted, rejects $de\widehat{i}nde$, $pro\widehat{i}nde$, etc., and supposes a species of elision between the two parts of the compound word, *e.g.* $d[e]inde$, etc. From the list of words given above, I have omitted the dissyllabic $e\widehat{i}dem$ (*ĭdem*), $e\widehat{i}sdem$ (*ĭsdem*), also the somewhat less frequent $e\widehat{a}dem$, $e\widehat{o}sdem$, etc., of Augustan poetry (L. Müller, *l.l.*, 297, 322), because these latter may seem to some capable of a different explanation.

[2] Of course, the synizesis here described does not apply to *all* the case-forms of *meus*, etc., nor to elided forms under all conditions ; cf. pp. 178, 201 f.

[3] Ritschl seems to be very nearly correct in saying (*Opusc.* II, 600 f.) that the whole conception of O. Lat. synizesis rests upon the semi-vocalic character of the two sounds, *i* and *u* — a statement which I wish, however, to interpret in the sense that *i* and *u* are half-vowels, and not full vowels, in these words. Of course, in the words which show synizesis, *e* sometimes represents an original *i*, and we find the spelling *iamus* (for *eamus*) in Inscrr., *iam* for *eam* (acc. sing. fem.) in Mss of Varro (Neue, II³, 381) and in the grammarians, initial *i*- in all the Oscan forms of the demonstrative pronoun *is* (Bronisch, *l.l.*, 97), etc. Yet, in reality, all the forms just named and especially, for example, the O. Lat. form *mius* (which is attested by the grammarians and, according to Lindsay, *L.L.* 21, by some of the derivative Romance forms, but which is needlessly explained away by Sommer, *Lat. Lautlehre*, 446), seem to show rather the general tendency of *ĕ* in hiatus to become close *e* and so approach the sound of *ĭ* ; for numerous examples of this tendency, see Lindsay, *L.L.* 19 ff.; Seelmann, *Ausspr. d. Lat.* 187 f.; note further Vergilian *miis*, attested by Quint. viii, 3, 25, according to a probable conjecture (Mss *mus*), and *ium* on a Luceria inscr., *CIL.* IX, 782. On the part played by the half-vowels *i* and *u* in synizesis, cf. also Corssen, *Ausspr.* II², 767; Ahlberg, *De procel.* I, 86.

stantly occurs before monosyllabic $(e)\bar{u}m$, $(e)\bar{o}$, etc., *e.g. Tri.*
197 *iuxtáque* $(e)am$ *cúro.* Further, the weak vowel is wholly
suppressed in the quasi-phonetic spelling of Ennius, *i.e. sis*,
(abl. pl.; cf. the double forms *suāvium* — which at times was
doubtless very nearly *sŭavium* — and *sāviŭm* [1]), and in the
vulgar forms *do, dae, quattor, des, quescas*, etc.; note also its
loss in the compound forms *ecc-um, ecc-am*, etc., while the con-
sonantal *i* of *iam* gives rise to the trisyllabic compounds *nunc-
iam, etiam*, etc. Although a total suppression of the vowels
e, i, and *u* does not ordinarily occur in O. Lat. synizesis, it
would yet be more nearly correct to say that we have their
suppression under certain conditions, than it would be to say
that we have their consonantization. For, as we have already
seen, the tendency in O. Lat. was rather to suppress vowel
i and vowel *u* than to fully consonantize them; cf. O. Lat.
ăbicio [2] with Augustan *ābyicio* (Vendryes, *L'intens. init.*
266 f.), and similarly *tenia* and *abete* would possibly be nearer
the O. Lat. colloquial pronunciation in some respects than
tēnvia and *ābyete*.[3]

To sum up: The vowels in question have not lost the
musical quality by virtue of which they are vowels, and have
not degenerated into the consonantal lack of tone. They are
vowels in the true sense of a sound that has tone, but they
are slurred or faded tones.[4] We may still further illustrate

[1] For numerous cases of the loss of post-consonantal *u* before the accent, in
vulgar Latin, see Lindsay, *L.L.* 268.

[2] One should rather say occasional O. Lat. *ăbicio;* for Exon's convincing study
(*Hermathena*, XIII (1904), 129 ff.) shows clearly that *ăbicio* is an exceptional
scansion in O. Lat., and its occurrence not wholly free from doubt in any case.

[3] It must be remembered, however, that the consonantal character of *j* and *v*
does not appear to have been fully developed in O. Lat. (cf. Lindsay, *L.L.* 45),
and it is probable, on the whole, that O. Lat. *j* and *v* were half-vowels (i, u)
rather than spirant consonants (y, w). Thus, according to one view (cf. Lorenz
on *Mo.* 642), synizesis takes place not only through *h*, as in *nihil, prehendo*, but
also through *j*, *e.g.* in *huius, quoius, eius;* but, in any case, it is clear that *j*
assumes a vocalic character in these words, cf. *conctus* from *coionctus*.

[4] A number of our editions of Plautus and Terence fall into the inaccuracy
of describing vowel *i* and vowel *u* in synizesis as consonants. Thus Hallidie, in
his edition of the *Captivi* (London, 1891, xliii), says expressly: "Another form
of contraction is caused by the vowel *i* being pronounced as the consonant *i* (y).
This method of pronunciation is adopted by the Augustan poets in such words as

the value of O. Lat. *meo* by three pronunciations of the English word *immediate*, which are all in use at the present time : (1) Careful speakers make it a word of four syllables, viz. *immē′ di-āt.* (2) Careless or unlearned people reduce it to three, viz. *immē′jŭt.* (3) Between these two extremes there is a pronunciation *immē′jĕ-ŭt*, in which the syllable *jĕ* is greatly weakened in pronunciation, and the word is reduced almost to a trisyllable; O. Lat. *meō* may be best compared with this third or intermediate pronunciation. Professor Fay (*Most.* xiii) also aptly compares the dissyllabic pronunciation of *bounteous, plenteous, radiant, happier*, and the like, in our current hymns. In conclusion, I wish to quote the admirable account of synizesis, which is given by Spengel (*Einl. zu Andria*, xxxi): "Die Zusammenziehung zweier Vokale innerhalb eines Wortes beruht auf Unterordnung des kurzen Vokals unter den folgenden langen, wodurch beide éin Zeitmass bilden, wie in der Musik ein kurzer Vorschlag durch das Anlehnen an eine lange Note die selbständige Messung im Takt verliert. Um das einsilbige *tuis, deos*, u. a. richtig auszusprechen, dürfen wir nicht auf die erste Silbe den Ton legen, noch auch beide Silben gleichmässig betonen, sondern der möglichst kurz gesprochene erste Vokal lehnt sich als Vorschlag an den lang und voll gesprochenen Hauptvokal an." [1]

ābiete." Similarly Wagner in his *Aulularia* (p. 62) and Ashmore in his *Adelphoe* (p. lxvii) state that the synizesis forms are to be pronounced *myîs, dyô, dyes, dye, dyūs, yōs, fwisse*, etc. Even Lindsay writes somewhat loosely (*L.L.* 439), "When *e* is followed by a long syllable, it passed in unaccented usage into *y* by synizesis, *e.g. eo, eos.*" (Lindsay, however, expresses the view elsewhere (*L.L.* 22) that the double forms *vinea* and *vinia, balteus* and *baltius*, etc., are to be explained by the tendency to give a vowel in hiatus the close sound rather than by the tendency to change *i* and *e* in hiatus into consonantal *i* (*y*).) On the other hand, Professor Fay (*Most.* xiii) aptly describes synizesis as " quasi-elision between impinging vowels of the same word "; and little exception can be taken to the definition given in Allen and Greenough's *New Latin Grammar* (§ 642), "the running together of two vowels without full contraction." With Fay's description, compare Consentius (Keil, V, 403), who cites as an example of a vowel elided between a consonant and a vowel Vergilian *d(u)odena* (*Geor.* i, 232), which was, however, probably read by Vergil *dŭŏdena* (cf. p. 199).

[1] Spengel (*l.l.*, xxxii) also compares the Romance derivatives, *e.g.* according to his view: Ital. *so* from *sc(i)o ;* Span. *dos* from *d(u)o, d(u)os ;* Ital. *fosse* from

II. Relation of Synizesis to Iambic Shortening. Law of Brevis Coalescens.

Points of Similarity. The Roman Quantitative Problem. — Many Plautine scholars have refuted C. F. W. Müller's attempted substitution of iambic shortening for synizesis in the case-forms *meo, tuo, deo,* and the like, and have shown the extreme improbability of this hypothesis. In the present section I shall attempt to offer additional proof of this conclusion, but it seems desirable first to point out that those critics who have advocated iambic shortening in these forms have directed attention to an important and a curious series of facts which their opponents had entirely overlooked. It is to this somewhat vague treatment of synizesis on the part of its professed advocates, and especially to their neglect to inquire into the ultimate cause of the phenomena in question, that the vitality of Müller's theory seems largely due,[1] and it therefore becomes important to explain clearly the problem of synizesis and to interpret the real meaning of the phenomena before we attempt a formal refutation of iambic shortening. Our first inquiry must be whether the great body of Plautine synizesis forms can be reduced to a *law;* for it is no real solution whatever to say, as is usually said, that synizesis occurs in "a limited circle of words and word-forms" (Brix, *Einl. zu Trin.* 20), or that it occurs in "certain words in very common use" (Fairclough, *Intr. to Andria,* lxi). The possibility of slurring the half-vowels *i* (*e*) and *u* in pronunciation being given (p. 170), we are called upon to explain

---

dissyllabic *fuisse;* Ital. *di* from monosyllabic *die, dies,* etc. On the pronunciation cf. also Bömer, *l.l.,* 43: "Duas vocales pronuntiatas esse . . . ita, ut utriusque sonus audiretur," and Leppermann, *l.l.,* 10: "Duae vocales una syllaba simul pronuntientur sed non in diphthongum coniunctae." Corssen also (II², 752) aptly describes the half-vowel *u* in synizesis as 'ein zwischen *v* und *u* schwebender Mittellaut von unmessbar kurzer Dauer,' and in his general discussion (II², 744 ff.) he makes very effective use at times of the rhythmical doctrine of the 'verschwindend kurzer Vocal.' If at other times he has clearly misused and perverted this doctrine, the underlying conception is none the less one of real value for the student of ancient metric.

[1] Cf. Stolz's somewhat hasty acceptance of this theory of Müller and Skutsch, Müller's *Handb.* II³, 2, 34; cf. also Gleditsch, *Metr.*³ 258.

why this slurring occurs in the dialogue metres in *meō,
deūm, eūm, eā, diē, diū,* but does not occur in *aúreŏ, fíliŏ,
grátĭis, línteŭm, pŏsteă, ántĕa, prídĭe, interdius;* [1] why it
occurs in *sciō, fuī, eāt, eāmus, eōdem,* but never in *néscĭŏ,* [2]
ádfuĭ, éxeăt, tránseăt, pródeăt, èxĕămus, èxeúntem, èxeúndum,
íntr(o)eúndi,* etc.; [3] why it occurs in *fuērunt, puĕlla, puĕr,*

---

[1] Ahlberg seems to think of this problem, when he writes of *deus* (*Procel.* I,
95): "Quoniam hoc subst. non nisi in certis collocationibus verborum *encliticam*
vim habet, . . . synizesis non adest in versibus his." Cf. below, pp. 177, 193 ff.

[2] Except in the peculiar locutions *nescio quis, nescio quid,* etc. Of the two
scansions which are metrically possible in such cases, viz. *nesc(i)ŏ-quis* and
nescĭŏ-quis, the former only should probably be admitted for O. Lat., but
whether we assume the process of shortening or of synizesis, the task of explain-
ing its applicability to the *trisyllabic* word *nescio* is equally difficult in either
case. In discussing these locutions, it is necessary to assume that the analogy of
the simple verb *scio* has in some way made itself felt, probably in the first case
through the *interrogative* locutions *sc(i)ŏ-quis* and *scin-quis;* for the latter,
which is usually overlooked, see Schrader's note and citations, *De -ne prosodia,*
21, n. 1. Luchs's study (*Hermes,* VI, 264 f.) of the *indefinite* locution *nescio-
quis* and its peculiar metrical treatment is well known, but Schrader's note shows
that he is mistaken in entirely rejecting, and that the editors are mistaken in
emending, the occasional occurrence of the peculiar scansion *nesc(i)ŏ-quis* in
the case of the *interrogative* locution also, viz.*Ba.* 795; *Tri.* 880; Pacuv. *tr. fr.*
294; *And.* 734 (accepted by Spengel, *Einl.* xxxii). Finally, Luchs denies that
the indefinite locution ever has the full scansion *nescĭŏ-quis,* but even this con-
clusion may perhaps be doubted, *v.* Seyffert, *Bursian's Jahresb.* 1894, 262, who
accepts the reading of B, *nescĭŏ-quem,* in *Men.* 407 (marked corrupt in ed.
min.). In O. Lat. a rigorous distinction cannot be drawn between the interroga-
tive and the indefinite locutions. — Since writing the above, I have become con-
vinced that the assumption of synizesis in *nesc(i)ŏquis* is improbable, and that
the usual value of the indefinite is much rather *nescĭŏquis,* with shortening due to
the addition of the enclitic *quis* (cf. Stolz, Müller's *Handb.* II³, 2, 55; Skutsch,
Γέρας, 136). The indefinite has, however, occasionally the original value *nescĭŏ-
quis* (cf. *siquidem* and *sīquidem*), while the interrogative has sometimes *within
the verse* the same value as the indefinite, viz. *nescĭŏ-quis.*

[3] A single apparent exception occurs in the case of the compound *perduellis,*
which is always trisyllabic in Pl., but in this case it is evident that the synizesis
of the simple form *duellum* has become so regular as finally to create a new
word (*dŭello* only *Am.* 189, cf. Müller, *Pl. Pr.* 236, 264); and Müller (*l.l.,* 237)
is undoubtedly correct in his view of this particular word, viz. that it does not
involve the coalescence of two vowels, but was pronounced in O. Lat. *dvellum*
(later *bellum*). The locution *nescio-quis,* which may also seem an excep-
tion, has already been discussed. The isolated *quattuor* of *Mo.* 630 (*quattŭor,*
ed. min.; *quattŏr,* Schöll in ed. mai., cf. *quatt(u)or* Enn. *A.* 90, 609 M.) does
not concern us closely; for it occurs in the first foot, which may have the free-

eāmus, eā, eŭm, eō, cf. *ais* $(\widehat{ain})$, but never in *fŭĕrint, pŭĕri* (cf.
Ritschl, *Proleg.* clxiv), *ăbĕamus, rĕdĕamus, intĕrĕa, sĕd-ĕum,
ăd-ĕum, ăb-ĕo, quĭd-ăis.*[1] These marked differences in treat-
ment appear at first sight somewhat perplexing and difficult
of solution, but I am indebted to the kindness of my col-
league, Professor M. Anstice Harris, for the valuable sug-
gestion that the explanation must be sought in the preference
of the Roman language or of all the Roman γένος διπλάσιον
metres for a particular rhythm.[2] On the whole, much might
be said in favor of the thesis that the fierce aggressiveness,
the sharp energy of the Roman national character, which
created a thoroughgoing system of regressive accentuation,
also inclined the Romans to prefer rhythms like the trochaic,
which begin with the arsis; cf. above, p. 168, and Christ,
Metr.[2] 208 f.[3] Yet the principle of the preferred rhythm has
in Latin a simpler and a more obvious application in the well-

dom of the γένος ἴσον, cf. *Ba.* 1204 *filiī* (anap. sept.). Much less do the reduced
forms of *hūius, illīus,* etc., belong here; for these were probably *huis, illīs*
(Luchs, *Studem. Stud.* I, 319 ff.). Ritschl (*Proleg.* clxiv, n.) admitted syni-
zesis in *anteā* and *posteā,* but the few and doubtful examples have long ago
been corrected; hence it is unnecessary to explain *anteā* and *posteā* as separable
composita in these cases, *i.e. ante eā, post eā.* The separable prepositional *com-
posita* of the value __ ᴜ __, *e.g. a-suo, ex-tuis, ad-suam, ex-ea,* etc., when they
stand detached from a substantive, are more frequently full forms, *i.e. āsuō,
éxtuìs,* and similar to the verbal composita *éxeŏ, nésciŏ.* Since, however, preposi-
tional *composita* of this kind retain many of the characteristics of their com-
ponent parts, they also freely exhibit the contract forms, but by no means so
frequently as the simple proclitics *suō, suăm, tuīs,* etc.

[1] Havet, *De Saturnio,* 32, quotes *quid* $\widehat{ais}$ from the verse-close, *Eu.* 654,
but the verse is one which all the editors agree in regarding as corrupt and
emend in some form (Fleck. and Dzi.: *quiˢd äis*).

[2] My indebtedness for helpful suggestion and aid is much greater than ap-
pears in this brief acknowledgment, and if I have been successful in avoiding at
this important point the somewhat narrow traditional view of the phenomena
under discussion, it is largely due to the fact that I have been generously assisted
by Professor Harris's critical judgment and clear insight into the fundamental
principles of rhythm. For the influence of the preferred rhythm upon English
word-forms in the loss or retention of weak syllables, see Hempl's study
"Learnèd and Learn'd," *Publ. Mod. Lang. Assoc.* XII, 318 ff.

[3] According to Roppenecker, *De emend. cantic. Plaut.,* Freising, 1894, p. 19,
the Latin language in the time of Plautus was less suited to ascending rhythms,
i.e. the iambic and especially the anapaestic.

known difficulty which the Romans experienced both in their prose and in their poetry in pronouncing an iambic word or iambic word-beginning, when the latter occurs in certain combinations that frequently arise in the continuous sequence of the sentence. Fortunately, it is not necessary to investigate afresh those combinations of syllables which the early Romans pronounced with difficulty ; they are precisely those which lead to the well-known phenomena of iambic shortening, and they have therefore often been carefully investigated and conveniently tabulated. I need only remark that the difficulty of pronouncing these syllable-groups was connected in ordinary or unrhythmical prose with a certain position of the *word-accent*, and numerous modifications in word-forms were thus assisted by word-accentuation ; on the other hand, in rhythmical prose and in poetry, where the word-accent was replaced by a *metrical accent* (largely similar in kind, cf. *Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc.* XXXV, 52), changes in word-forms were produced also by the latter. Hence poetry has at its disposal both series of modified word-forms, but such is the constitution of iambic and trochaic verse that the effects of the rhythmical accent are usually only a continuation of the effects which the word-accent tends to bring about in common speech, and only rarely run counter to the latter, *e.g.* the pretonic syncope seen in *m(e)um gnátum* may be produced equally well by the rhythmical accentuation *m(e)úm gnatúm*. In the present discussion, however, the legitimate operation of both accents will be recognized.

The difficult quantitative combinations which the Latin language seeks to escape by the use of iambic shortening are conveniently enumerated by Dziatzko-Hauler (*Einl. zu Phormio,* 51) as follows : (1) $\smile \_ \angle$; (2) $\smile \_ \breve{\diagup} \smile$; (3) $\breve{\diagup} \_$. It is universally recognized that in all these sequences it is the presence of the short syllable which constitutes the disturbing element, and that the pronunciation of this syllable, *e.g.* in the sequence $\smile \_ \angle$, makes it difficult to give the immediately following long its proper value, when the voice is hastening to the second and accented long ; hence this short syllable is properly called a *Brevis Brevians*,

but in the γένος διπλάσιον the *Brevians* is of necessity regularly restricted to an initial syllable, if the verses of this γένος are to be readable and its rhythm to be kept distinct from the rhythm of the γένος ἴσον. The vocal organs experience, of course, precisely the same difficulty in pronouncing the particular sequences named above, whether the vowel of the first syllable is separated from the vowel of the following by a consonant or not, but the method of removing the difficulty is different in the two cases. The language must, of course, in dealing with each case, follow the line of least resistance, and, in the case of the half-vowels *i* (*e*) and *u* in hiatus, all ancient usage, both linguistic and metrical, proclaims that the least and the simplest modification consists in the slurring of these sounds.[1] Hence the original sequences are modified as follows through the law of *Brevis Coalescens*, as it may be termed: I. $\smile \_ \angle$ is changed to $\_ \angle$: *Hec.* 185 d(i)es ést; *Tru.* 324 d(i)u quám; *Cur.* 240 l(i)eni óptumúmst; *Tri.* 197 (e)am cúro; *Poe.* 104 eas pérdidít; *Mi.* 246 e⁴x (e)a míles; *Am.* 1004 m(e)o me áequomst; *Ci.* 80 s(u)amrem o³btinére; *Cap.* 130 s(u)i-gnáti; *Ep.* 702 t(u)i-gna⁴ti. The foregoing changes are brought about properly by the word-accent (which is here, as it happens, reinforced by the verse-accent), but the verse-accent alone may continue the work of prose, *e.g.* *Au.* 299 s(u)am-rém (in prose: s(u)ámrem); *Mi.* 736 qui[1] d(e)orúm. II. $\smile \_ \, \smile \, \smile$ is changed to $\angle \smile \smile$: *Cu.* 671 m(e)am-rem ágere; *Cap.* 363 t(u)o véteri. III. (*a*) $\smile \angle$ is changed in actual speech to $\angle$, both quantity and accent uniting to reduce the weak half-vowel, as in (*e*)ósdem, d(e)órum, by a species of pretonic syncope. (*b*) $\smile \_$, or rather $\frown$, is changed to $\angle$, that is, in cases like déos, involving the weakly uttered half-vowels, quantity prevails over an unstable accent, and produces d(e)ós (cf. *Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc.* XXXV, 58 n.),[2] while in other and far

---

[1] For the relation of vowel and consonant *i* and *u* in Skt., cf. Whitney, *Skt. Gramm.* 55 ff., 129; Corssen, II², 768.

[2] There is a quite unnecessary outcry on the part of many against 'synizesis in the arsis,' and Skutsch (*Sat. Viadr.* 144) and Ahlberg (*De procel.* I, 93 ff.)

more numerous cases like *meum-gnátum,* the iambic dissyl-
lable loses the accent entirely through proclisis (see below,
p. 193): *Ba.* 124 d(e)órum; *Poe.* 1422 (e)a⁴mus; *Cur.* 220
l(i)ēne; *Ep.* 338 qu(i)éto; *Am.* 549 d(i)e³s ut; *Cap.* 881
(me)u³m qui gnátum; *Am.* 827 t(u)a¹m-rem cúret; *And.*
385 ex (e)á-re; *Men.* 81, *Poe.* 1338, *Ad.* 959 m(e)á-quidém
sentèntiá; *Cap.* 987 véndidísti m(e)o⁷ patrí; *Ep.* 582 f. quaé
patrém | T(u)o¹m vocás; *As.* 878 t(u)o⁵m virúm conspéxerís;
Tri. 192 cúres t(u)ám fidém; *Cur.* 702 dícam m(e)a⁶m sen-
téntiám; *Cap.* 867 t(u)o a¹rbitrátu. In examples like the
following the verse-accent continues the effects of the word-
accents: *Mo.* 1120 t(u)i²-gnatí sodálem (in prose: t(u)i-
gnáti); *Ps.* 120 t(u)óm tangám patrém; *Am.* 126 m(e)ó
possém patrí; *Mi.* 723 d(i)u⁶ vitám.

The law of *Brevis Coalescens* may be stated then as follows
for the γένος διπλάσιον and the γένος ἡμιόλιον: An iambic
sequence of syllables, if initial, *i.e.* if forming a single word
or a word-beginning, has the value of a single long, in case

have concluded too hastily that 'Synizese in der Hebung ist ein Unding.' Un-
doubtedly, considerable importance should be attached to Latin word-accent,
but it should not be converted into a fetish, nor should the dogma be promul-
gated that the word-accent in its theoretical form must prevail under all phonetic
conditions (see below, p. 193 ff.); compare the treatment of the accented or 'arsis'
syllable in the contracted forms, *di, dis, is, nil, dest, sis* (for *suis*), and in the
synizesis forms *deïn, dehïnc, proïn, proïit, quoïid,* also in *Iovem, bis* for O. Lat.
Dioṽem, duis (Paul. Fest. 46, 6 Th.). The argument against synizesis in the
arsis is stated by Gleditsch (*Metr.*³ 258) as follows: " In zweisilbigen Wörtern
wie *eos, tuos* und in dreisilbigen wie *eorum,* wenn sie den Iktus auf der ersten
Silbe tragen, wie *Trin.* 238 éos cupít, eos cónsectábar, erscheint es viel natür-
licher an Kürzung der zweiten Silbe in *eos* zu denken und die Wörter pyrrhichisch
zu messen als Synizese anzunehmen. Vgl. ebd. 295 mĕŏ modo et." Unfortunately
this argument involves a manifest *petitio principii,* when it boldly assumes that
there is a full and complete 'first syllable' in *eos, tuos,* etc., while, in fact, it is
evident that if we have the prose accents—particularly in case of the proclitic
pronouns— (*e*)*ós-cupit* (or even (*e*)*os-cúpit*), (*e*)*os-cépit,* the verse-accents (*e*)*ós-
cupit,* (*e*)*ós-cepit* follow naturally; for a fuller statement of my views, see below,
p. 185. Especially unfortunate is the example *mĕŏ modo* (*Tri.* 295), in view of
quómodo, eómodo, eiúsmodi, quodámmodo, illómodo, etc. Similarly, Ahlberg's
chapter on Synizesis is a valuable one, but his theory of synizesis in the thesis,
e.g. m(*e*)*os sine,* but iambic shortening in the arsis, *e.g. sine mĕŏs,* breaks down

the former of the two syllables contains the half-vowel *u* or *i*,
or the similarly pronounced *e*, in hiatus.[1] This law enables
us very largely to see why ' monosyllabic' *sc(i)o, m(e)o* do not
occur in verse-closes, except at the end of the anap. oct. and
anap. dim. ac., which conclude with the ictus ($-\,\angle$).[2] These
contracted forms could not in any case occur in verses which
end with an iambus (iamb. trim., troch. sept.), where metrical
convention has given the half-vowel the full value of a mora,
but they might be expected on first thought to occur in verses
which end in a trochee (iamb. sept., troch. oct.)[3] *e.g. placét
m(e)o* like *placet mi, Mo.* 175. Yet even here we see that the
O. Lat. poets never treated *meo* as a genuine monosyllable
and never placed it at the end of a metrical sentence as such;
in short, the quasi-monosyllabic pronunciation requires an
accent to ·*follow* the slurred word in an immediate sequence
either of the sentence or of the verse (as *placét m(e)o sí*), and
not to follow it, for example, at the beginning of another
line. Cf. the absence of *fac* and *nil* from early verse-closes,
and Skutsch's former view, *Forsch.* 57.[4] For further dis-
cussion of this question, see below, p. 208.

---

completely, as he himself sees (*l.l.*, 104), when it is applied to O. Lat. *n(ih)il* and
n(ih)iln[e]. This theory also breaks down completely when applied to the
verse of other Latin poets who do not admit shortening, *e.g.* Enn. *A.* 151 M.
(Lucr. iii, 1023) lúmina sís oculís; Auson. *Sap. prol.* 29 pronúntiáre s(u)ás
solént senténtiás; Terentianus Maur. 1609 vim s(u)ám tuetur. Cf. also Seyffert's
criticism of this theory, *Berl. philol. Wochenschr.*, 1900, 1611 ff.

[1] In anapaestic cantica (the γένος ἴσον), it is perhaps possible, as was formerly
assumed by Ritschl and Spengel, that synizesis, like iambic shortening, is applied
to other than initial syllables, *e.g.* to *aur(e)o, fil(i)o*, but the discussion of this
question does not fall within the limits of the present paper, and is of less impor-
tance, since the anapaestic rhythm does not accurately represent the spoken
language.

[2] But in these repeatedly, *e.g. Ba.* 1153 facito út faciás. ‖ Taceás. tu *tuóm*
facito : égo quod díxi haud mútabó, a verse in which Müller (*Nachträge*, 55) seeks
in vain to find a flaw. There is some reason, however, to doubt the admissibility
of synizesis in the close of the anap. oct.; see below, p. 209, n. 1.

[3] About 1520 verses in all.

[4] "So erklärt sich . . . das Fehlen einsilbiger Formen dieser Worte am Vers-
ende. Die lautlichen Bedingungen für die Synizese sind eben nur im Satzzu-

Points of Dissimilarity. Word-Forms and Complexes. — We have seen the basis of similarity which exists between synizesis and iambic shortening; there are also fundamental differences between the two. The most important of these differences are the following : (1) Since synizesis is a much easier and much simpler modification than iambic shortening, slurred forms are proportionally in much more frequent use than shortened forms.[1] (2) Slurred forms ending in the diphthong *ae* and in *s* preceded by a naturally long vowel are very freely used, while shortened forms are rare in the case of these endings.[2] (3) Slurring is most freely applied to a large class of words and word-complexes, which, on account of their accentual relations, only rarely and exceptionally admit shortening. The third point of difference is the one which I propose chiefly to discuss, and its extent may best be shown by an enumeration of the different *classes* of words to which synizesis is *freely* applied :

(1) Iambic words, *e.g. meae, eī, quoiī, duos, trium, quia,*[3] *iō*

sammenhange gegeben." — I cannot say whether the dramatists always retain the full form at the end of a complete sentence, *i.e.* when there is a change of speaker, but my examples clearly show that this is their regular usage : *Au.* 154 in rem hóc tŭámst. ; *Mer.* 485; *Tri.* 197, etc.

[1] According to the quite inaccurate statistics of Leppermann (*l.l.,* 78), in forms of declension, the synizesis forms are at least three times as frequent within the verse as the non-synizesis forms (a very decided underestimate ; cf. below, p. 183); on the other hand, the forms without shortening are nine times more frequent in Pl. and nearly six times more frequent in Ter. than the shortened forms. Skutsch (*Sat. Viadr.* 135) has attempted to explain away the significance of these facts by the special plea that two vowels in immediate contact are particularly conducive to iambic shortening. *We have, however, in Latin the principle " vocalis ante vocalem corripitur," not the principle " vocalis post vocalem corripitur ";* otherwise we might expect to find in Pl. abĕămus, abĕŭndum, abiĕre, abiīsses, abstinŭïssem, accipiĕmur, accubŭïsti, acquiĕscam, adveniĕntem, dhēnus, allĕnus, etc.

[2] According to Bömer (*l.l.,* 41) synizesis forms in *ae* and in *s* are one and a half times as frequent within the verse as non-synizesis forms, while, on the other hand, forms in *ae* and *s* without shortening are seven times more frequent than shortened forms ; cf. also Lindsay, *Journal of Philology,* XXI, 206.

[3] *I.e.* when the ultima is elided before a *long* vowel : *Mer.* 543 qu(i)a úxor
ŕúrist, cf. *Mi.* 1278 qu(i)a aedís, and Leo's note *ad loc.;* so also in later poetry : Terentianus Maur. 1090 quia ét variis pedibus loquimur sermone soluto; Venant. *Miscell.* ii, 15, 8 filius ut dicant quïast creătura dei, cf. L. Müller, *R.M.*[2], 323.

(*Ps.* 703), *deūm*,[1] *deām*, *diēs*,[2] *liēn* (always),[3] *viā*, *Creō*, *fuī*, *sciō*,[4] *eō*, *queō*, *beō*, *diū*, *eō* (adv.), etc.   (Words of the same

[1] See Abraham, *Stud. Plaut.* 204 f. The nom. sing. in Pl. is of course always *dĕŭ* (Abraham is clearly mistaken in assuming *deūs*, see below, p. 201) ; the short vowel is also always preserved in hiatus (*dĕŭm, Cap.* 865) or in elision before a short vowel, and may be preserved in elision before a long vowel, *e.g.* the phrase *prŏ dĕum átque homĭnùm fĭdém* occurs three times in trochaic and once in iambic verse (*Cu.* 694 ; *Ep.* 580 ; *And.* 246 ; *Hau.* 61), while *pro d(e)um átque homĭnùm f.* occurs once in iambic (*Hec.* 198). An absolute metrical proof of the contract-forms is afforded by *Phor.* 764 sed pér-deos átque homĭnés, where *pérdĕŏs átque* is no more possible than *fĭlĭ̆ăs átque* would be (cf. *A.J.P.*, XXV, 262, 417) ; similarly, *Cap.* 727, *Mi.* 541, *Tri.* 520 per-deós atque hómines ; cf. *Cas.* 336 ad-deós minoris. Pl. retains the full forms *dĕŏs, deūm, de[um], deo-rum, deō*, exclusive of two cases in the verse-close and of two in cretic and bacchic verse, only six times against seventy-three cases of the contract forms. This extreme weakening of the short vowel, which is even more pronounced than that of the proclitics *meo, tuo*, is evidently due in part to the trite use of the word in oaths, adjurations, and emotional language in general (cf. the reduction seen in the English *odd's death, 's death, zounds*, etc.). Upon the difficult problem of *di* and *dis*, the sole O. Lat. forms of the nom. and abl. pl., I shall not venture to express an opinion ; Sturtevant is correct (*l.l.*, 20) in viewing these forms as absolute monosyllables, and rejecting this value for *deūm, deō*, etc., but quite contrary to his assumption (p. 33), all these dissyllabic forms of *deus* were verging towards monosyllabic pronunciation in the time of Pl. ; for the late and vulgar forms, *do, dae,* cf. p. 201.

[2] According to Gellius (x, 24, 1) the compound *diequinti* was pronounced in the Republican age '*secunda syllaba correpta*,' but Lindsay (*Journal of Philology*, XXI, 205) justly suspects that ' synizesis of the first two syllables was the real influence at work here ' ; cf. d(i)e se⁷ptimí *Men.* 1156, but hóc-diè crástinì, *Mo.* 881. The present statement of Gellius is quite similar to that other tradition mentioned by the grammarian Priscian (Keil, III, 511, 20), which our Latin grammars accept so confidently, viz. that O. Lat. genitives of the second decl., like *tŭgŭri* (the standard example), are to be accented on the penult. But, as a matter of fact, Priscian probably had no trustworthy information upon this subject, since the form, though sometimes retained in poetry (L. Müller, *R.M.*² 442), had passed out of actual use centuries before his time, and he had consequently never heard the pronunciation in question ; it is noteworthy that Pl. never uses a proceleusmaticus like *sed ingĕni, sed aŭxĭli*, and if a vestige of true tradition had reached Priscian, instead of Nigidius Figulus's *differentiae causa* example (*Valéri* and *Váleri*), he would have known that the republican accentuation was both *tŭgŭrium* and *tŭgŭri*.

[3] According to the grammarians (*e.g.* Priscian, Keil, I, 149, 7), Pl. used, after the analogy of *liēn*, a singular *riĕn* instead of **rēn*. Whether he used this form also in the pl., and *rēnés, Cu.* 236, represents *r(i)ēnés*, cannot easily be determined.

[4] In Pl. apparently only *sciō* and *sc(i)ō;* similarly the grammarians noticed that Vergil does not shorten the final *o* of verbs, and hence, according to Chari-

quantitive value are *also subject to I. Shortening*, except, as a rule, those which end in *ae* or in *s*.)

(2) Tetrasyllabic words and word-complexes of the same quantitative value as *voluptátem, i.e.* $\cup \_ \angle \_$, *e.g. eōrúndem, eāprópter(And.* 959), *liēnosus(Cas.* 414), *diērectus,(e)andémrem, (e)o-pácto, (e)ā-caúsa, m(e)um-frátrem, m(e)ā-caúsa,* etc.; cf. also *c(o)agmenta, c(o)emisse,* etc. (*Also subject to I. Shortening.*)

(3) Trisyllabic words and word-complexes of the value of a bacchius ($\cup \angle \_$), *e.g. eamus,[1] deorum,[2] tuorum, duobus, eos-dem, eorum, eumpse suopte, fuisse, puella,* cf. *duellum* (p. 174, n. 3), *liene (Cur.* 220), *diebus (Poe.* 1207), *creatos* (Cic. *Agr.* ii, 31, acc. to Zielinski, *Clauselgesetz in Ciceros Reden,* 175), *quiesce (Mer.* 448), *quierintne (Per.* 78), *quieto (Ep.* 338), *Heauton(Heau.* prol. 5), *Biarci (CLE.* 1602, 1), *m(e)ám-rem, (e)ám-rem, m(e)ám-spem,* etc.; cf. also *d(e)orsum, s(e)orsum, c(o)egi, c(o)erce,* etc. (*Not usually subject to I. Shortening.*)

(4) Tetrasyllabic words and word-complexes of the value $\cup \angle \cup \cup$, *e.g. Cl(e)ostrata* (always), *Diespiter (Poe.* 869), cf. late *D(i)arrytos, CLE.* 107, 4 ('the well-watered country,' written also *Zaritus*), *duodecim (Ep.* 675), *diūtius, diūtinus,*[3]

sius (Keil, I, 16, 9 ff.), some of them wished to pronounce : nunc *sco* quid sit amor (*Ecl.* viii, 43). But this usage in Vergil is very doubtful, since, except in a very limited number of cases (*isdem, eosdem, io, deinde,* etc.) the classical poets rejected the early synizesis as vulgar, and cultivated speech introduced *scŏ, dŭŏ,* etc., instead ; cf. p. 199.

[1] Of the twenty-three certain cases of *(e)ámus* cited by Müller (*Pl. Pr.* 271), fifteen occur in the first and fifth feet of troch. sept., where, acc. to Ahlberg (*Iamb. corrept.* 34), an accent *eámus* is tolerated in a few cases ; four cases (*Cur.* 670 ; *Mi.* 78 ; *Poe.* 1162, 1342) are cited from an iambic first foot, where *eámus,* acc. to Ahlberg, is not tolerated ; four occur within the verse where *eámus* is extremely unlikely, viz. *Ep.* 157, *Men.* 422 ea³mus, íntro ; *Poe.* 1422 áge sis, ea⁴mus ; *St.* 622 ea⁷mus, tu. Since the total number of occurrences of the word is only thirty-one, it is impossible to assume twenty-three cases of *eámus ;* cf. Lindsay, *Captivi,* 28.

[2] *D(e)órum* without elision occurs three times in the first and fifth feet of troch. sept. (*Ep.* 675 ; *Men.* 217 ; *Mi.* 736), once in an iambic first foot (*Am.* 45) and twice within the verse, viz. *Ba.* 124 d(e)órum ; Att. *Trag. Praet.* 7 d(e)órum ; *dĕŏrum* occurs twice : *And.* 959 ; *Hau.* 693. It is clear that, out of eight cases of the unelided word, we cannot assume six cases of *dĕŏrum.*

[3] In later pronunciation the *i* (like the *u* in *duŏ*) was fully restored in these words, *i.e. d'iūtius, d'iūtinus, d'iūturnus,* and after this restoration the Augustan

m(e)ā-quidem, *m(e)úm-quidem*, *(e)ó-modo ;* cf. also *m(e)úm-patrem*, *m(e)úm-virum*, *m(e)ám-fidem*, *m(e)aé-domi*, *m(e)ā-manu*,[1] etc. ; cf. *c(o)addito*, *c(o)actio*, *a[v]unculus*. (*Not usually subject to I. Shortening.*)

(5) Many other word-complexes and phrases beginning with an iambic sequence, *e.g. m(e)ɔ-períclo*, *m(e)ɔ-sodáli*, *m(e)ae-soróri ;* cf. *d(e)artuatus*, *d(e)asciari*, *d(e)osculari*. (*Also subject to I. Shortening.*)

The wide differences which separate synizesis and iambic shortening will be made clear by a careful examination of the classes marked (3) and (4) above. The two processes, however, again came together in the following class of *composita :*

(6) Whenever a short monosyllable precedes an iambic word, and, through its collocation, receives the word-accent neither shortening nor slurring is admitted in the *trisyllabic compositum* thus formed, the anapaestic character of which is sustained by the rhythm both of prose and of verse, *e.g. séd-ubī*, *quís-homō*, *quíd-agō*, *áb-erō;*[2] *sĕd-ĕunt*, *ăb-ĕīs*, *tĭb(i)-ĕum*, *quĭd-ĕ(um) aūt*, cf. *sĕd-ĕīdem* (*Mi.* 758), etc. For further discussion of these *composita*, see p. 206 f.

Statistics of Synizesis. — According to the only trustworthy statistics which we possess, viz. those of Bömer, *l.l.*, 41, the unelided iambic case-forms of *deus*, *duo*, *meus*, *tuos*, *suos*, and *is*, treated with synizesis, are at least nine times as

poets, in view of the peculiar difficulty of these word-forms, appear to have adopted the negligent pronunciation with iambic shortening, *i.e. dĭŭtúrnus* (cf. *dŭŏdéni* for *duōdéni*) and even *dĭŭtius* (from *dĭŭtius*, cf. *vidĕlicet* from *vĭdĕlicet*), see the examples cited by L. Müller, *R.M.*[2] 431 ; in the time of Pl., however, the *i* was too weakly pronounced in these words to serve as a *Brevis Brevians*, cf. *dudum* from **diudum*. For other discussions of the vexed problem of *diutius*, cf. Solmsen, *Studien z. lat. Lautgesch.* 191 ff., Ahlberg, *De procel.* I, 99 ff., and esp. Fleckeisen, *Neue Jahrb.* CI (1870), 69 ff. The correct view is suggested by Stolz in the second edition of Müller's *Handb.* (II², 2, § 40, 4).

[1] *Meā-quidem, eō-modo* are certainly accented as single words ; for the restricted sense in which alone we have word-complexes accented *m(e)úm-patrem*, etc., see below, p. 197.

[2] Cf. the particle *ideō*, which is found with shortened *o* perhaps first in Martial (i, 1, 4).

frequent within the verse as the non-synizesis forms.[1]   We
have already seen that a chief reason why slurred forms
are proportionally so much more frequent than shortened
forms is the slighter modification which is involved in
the slurring pronunciation, but there is also another reason
to be assigned for the great wave of synizesis which in
O. Lat. swept over the case-forms just named.   In the
case of *deūm*, an explanation may perhaps be found in
the trite use of this noun; in the case of the proclitic
and weakly accented pronouns, the regular synizesis is
clearly due to the thoroughgoing effects of a species of
pretonic syncope in the spoken language, *e.g.* $(e)\bar{o}$-*modo*,
t(u)ám-rem, *t(u)om-frátrem*, etc.   Before I proceed, how-
ever, to exhibit the full effects of this approximate 'syn-
cope' upon the pronouns, I wish to state the logical grounds
which cause me to deny the possibility of the same word-form
admitting both synizesis and shortening.[2]   First, in a very
large number of cases of dimoric *deo*, *meo*, and of trimoric
eamus, *deorum* synizesis may be absolutely proved; the ques-
tion remains whether we are justified in concluding from these
numerous cases the presence of synizesis in all.   I hold that
we are reasonably justified in this conclusion, and that words
in which a short syllable is *usually* weakened indefinitely in
pronunciation are not likely to have an entirely different pro-
nunciation in which this short becomes so predominant and so
clearly enunciated as to assist in weakening a following long.
In short, a *Brevis Coalescens* is not likely also to be a *Brevis*

---

[1] The result is obtained as follows : Omitting 4 synizesis forms of *dies, die, via,*
which are less often slurred, there are 147 synizesis forms of unelided iambic
words in Terence.   Bömer computes 66 non-synizesis forms, but from these we
must subtract 5 cases at end of hemistich, 11 cases of *dies, die, via,* and 34 cases
of the *trisyllabic* groups *sĕd-ĕō, ăb-ĕō, ĭn-ĕōs,* cf. *intĕr-ĕōs,* etc.; these last are
recognized by Bömer himself as cases that stand apart.   Hence the non-synizesis
forms of dissyllabic *eo, deo,* etc., reduce to 16.   Bömer's figures do not include
occurrences of *i, ei, is, eis, di, dis,* nor of dat. sing. *ei.*   For statistics of the metrical
inscriptions, see Hodgman, *Harvard Stud.* IX, 151 f.   My own unfinished sta-
tistics for two plays of Plautus confirm Bömer's results.

[2] Lindsay, *Captivi,* 26 f., suggests that *ĕō* ('go'), *mĕăm* and *sŭĭst* are the
preferable scansions in verses that he would scan as iamb. monom. (*Cas.* 715),

Brevians, and a syllable that is habitually slurred seems little more likely to act as a *Brevians* than a syllable that is ' elided,' *e.g.* the *e* in *dic(e) hunc*.   In a period when the initial syllable of *deo* was usually weakened in pronunciation, it is evident that it could regain its full value only through the usage of careful speakers, but these latter would be likely to pronounce *dĕō*, and the pronunciation *dĕŏ* would probably not exist at all. These general considerations reach the highest degree of cogency in the case of the pronominal forms, which have become through proclisis either wholly oxytone, as *ĕûm*, or very largely so, as *mĕûm;* see my " Studies in Accent," *Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc.* XXXV, 40.[1]   A possible objection must be answered here, which is implied in the views expressed by Skutsch, *Berl. philol. Wochenschr.*, 1894, 265 f. In this discussion Skutsch appears to have no very clear conception of the extent of the proclisis of these pronouns, but he admits that in the cases (which he evidently regards as few in number) in which *meo, suo*, were proclitic or enclitic, the first vowel, through the loss of its accent, might perhaps be consonantized ; in all other cases, however, the first vowel must, he holds, remain accented and retain its

---

glyconic (*Cur.* 155), and choriambic tetr. (*Cas.* 629) respectively, but since the metre of all these lines is doubtful in the extreme, these examples have no cogency whatever, and even if it could be shown that Pl. had employed the scansions *mĕăm, sŭĭst* in glyconic and choriambic lines, this fact would have little bearing upon his usage in ordinary metres, but would require to be explained through the prosodical license *dialysis* or *diaeresis*, just as Lucretius, in dactylic verse, scans *sŭadeo, dissolŭensque*, etc. (L. Müller, *R.M.*[2] 308).

[1] The cases of oxytone *ĕăm, ĕăs*, etc., in the third foot of the senarius, may be cited here in full : *Tri.* 794 ĕás resígnatás sibí ; *Ci.* 568 ĕám suam ésse ; *Tru.* 85 ĕó nunc cónmentáꟅt ; *Tri. arg.* 6 ĕí det ; *Mi.* 484 ĕám modo óffendí ; *ib.* 97 in sérvitútem ăb ĕó ; *Turp. com. fr.* 130 ĕás minóris ; *And.* 442 ĕám-rem ; cf. also the double-iamb. verse-close : *Men.* 880 átque ĕám meaé. Similarly, we find two cases of oxytone *mĕŏ, tŭaé* in the third foot : *Tru.* 656 Márs mĕŏ períratús patrí ; *Poe.* 1103 fíliaé tŭaé sint ámbae.   More frequent cases do not occur for the reason that these forms do not admit elision before them as is always conveniently the case with *ĕăm* in the third foot, and especially because synizesis is the customary use in this place, *e.g. And.* 880 et s(u)í volúntatém patrís ; *Am.* 31 m(e)í patrís ; *Cap. prol.* 50 s(u)ó sibí.

full value.[1] In other words Skutsch would perhaps admit synizesis in *Tri.* 192 cúres t(u)ám-fidém, but he would reject it in *Ps.* 631 m(e)a⁵m qui fúrcillés fidem; he would perhaps admit it in *Cap.* 1024 m(e)u⁵m-patrém vocáriér, *Ep.* 582 f. patrem | T(u)-o¹m-vocás, *ib.* 487 m(e)um-gnátum, but would reject it in *Ps.* 120 t(u)óm tangám patrém, *Cap.* 881 m(e)u³m qui gnátum, etc. Unfortunately, however, for this and for all similar *a priori* distinctions, actual speech does not have its various usages neatly labelled and carefully pigeon-holed in separate compartments, in the manner which this view seems to presuppose; on the contrary, through the effects of analogy, such usages arę often greatly confused and intermingled. I do not need, however, to enter here into any detailed discussion of the principles involved, but shall simply cite the much more complete and much more important views expressed by Skutsch himself in another place. For the narrow view of proclisis implied in the present passage is wholly inconsistent with the generous and thoroughgoing proclisis justly demanded for *illúm, istúm, ipsúm* in the *Plaut. Forschungen.* Thus in the latter work, while pointing out that these accentuations originally arose in certain cases of proclisis like *illúm-pătrem, illúm-vĭdet, illám-rem,* etc., Skutsch recognizes in the clearest manner possible that the oxytonesis in question has been indefinitely extended in the actual Plautine language, and may be used in any collocation whatever, as in *illúm frātrem, illúm cērnit;* see esp. *Forsch.*, 137, 132 ff. This view of a developed oxytonesis is undoubtedly the correct one both for *illúm* and for *meúm.*

Pretonic Syncope with 'Rem.' Definite Metrical Proof. — A definite metrical test of the extent of pretonic 'syncope' may be made by observing the pronouns when they immediately precede *res;* for it is well known that, in this position, they form with *res* a single word, *i.e. omném-rem, tantám-rem, aliás-*

[1] " Wo *meo, suo* pro- oder enklitisch waren . . . , da konnte der erste Vokal, seines Accents verlustig, konsonantisiert werden ; wo aber das Wort betont blieb, . . . musste die erste Silbe Tonträgerin und folglich der Vokal voller Vokal bleiben."

res, ipsá-re, illám-rem, cf. *CIL.* I, 206 (*Lex Iulia Munic.*, 45 B.C.) 44 *eamrim, eare, ib.* 161 *eaires ;* see further my article in *Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc.* XXXV, 39, and also G. Ramain, *Études sur les groupes de mots*, Paris, 1904, pp. 151, 161, 176. I have examined for this purpose all the occurrences in the dramatists of the single case-form *rem* (acc. sing.), when immediately preceded by *meam, tuam, suam*, and of the twenty-six cases which actually occur, I find that twenty-two cases, occurring in iambic or trochaic verse, show pretonic syncope; the text or kind of verse is uncertain in two cases (*Au.* 134; *Tri.* 139), but appears also to yield the syncopated form, and in two cases only, one in iambic, one in anapaestic, verse (*Poe.* 659; *Per.* 781), are the full forms retained. The γένος διπλά-σιον, which closely represents actual speech, therefore shows pretonic syncope to be more than twenty times as frequent as the original iambic form. The accent *tŭăm-rem* would of course be possible in a few cases, but not in many, *e.g.* in the dramatists the accent *malám-rem* is certain in twenty-eight of the thirty occurrences of this locution, while *mălăm-rem* occurs once in anapaests (*Ps.* 234) and once in a corrupt passage (*Tru.* 937). On the other hand, when *tuam* precedes *rem* but is separated by intervening words, synizesis occurs in only half the cases (contrast *Poe.* 1083; *Tru.* 965; *Tri.* 139 (?) with *Mer.* 1011; *Ps.* 253; *Tri.* 621), but this low ratio is accidental and is quite unusual in other cases. The examples of *meam-rem* in the dramatists are as follows: *Am.* 827 t(u)a^{1}m rem cúret; *Au.* 134 ut⟨í⟩ t(u)àm rĕm (bacch., acc. to ed. mai.); *ib.* 299 s(u)am rém periísse; *Cap.* 632 m(e)a^{1}m rem nón curés; *Cas.* 89 non míhi licére m(e)ám rem; *Ci.* 81 nón potést s(u)a^{3}m rem; *Cu.* 671 m(e)am rem ágere; *Mer.* 48 válide s(u)ám rem; *ib.* 454 s(u)a^{5}m rem esse aéquomst; *Mi.* 951 t(u)a^{2}m rem cúra; *ib.* 1117 t(u)ám rem túte agás; *Per.* 513 ad m(e)a^{3}m rem; *ib.* 781 itaqué mĕam rém (anap. oct.); *Poe.* 675 t(u)ám rem tú ages; *ib.* 659 áge[re] tŭám rem: occásióst; 679 t(u)ám rem, | ádulescéns, loquí; 750 éxplicávi m(e)ám rem;

Ps. 496 m(e)ám rem sápio; *Ru.* 1399 tun m(e)a³m rem símu-
las; *Tri.* 139 s(u)ám rem mélius gésserít (so ed. mai. after
Hermann; Mss: s(u)ám meliús rem gésserít); *ib.* 327 s(u)a⁵m
rem tráctavít; 1083 quoi t(u)a⁵m rem; *Phor.* 467 álios t(u)a²m
rem; *Ad.* 771 ac t(u)ám rem; Caecil. *com. fr.* 46 m(e)a³m
rem iam ómnem; Enn. *tr. fr.* 220 s(u)a²m rem béne gessére.

Similarly we have synizesis in the case-forms *m(e)ae-res*
(nom. pl.), *m(e)as-res* (acc. pl.) three times: *Phor.* 820; *Tri.*
269 (anap.); *ib.* 446;—in a fourth case, *Ci.* 719, the scan-
sion is doubtful: egó tibi m(e)ás res, or ego tíbi mĕás res.
Finally, we may take a case-form of the same word where
Latin accent-laws would allow us to use shortening, *i.e. meis
rebus.* Three cases occur, always with dimoric pronoun:
Cap. 968; *Cas.* 938 (dactylic); *Tri.* 446:

> Bonís tuis rébus m(e)ás-res ínridés malás.

Shall we then accept always *m(e)ás-res, t(u)ás-res,* but decide
to scan *tŭĭs rébus* with shortening? Shall we accept always
m(e)órum, (e)ámus, but admit with shortening *mĕŏ, ĕŭnt?*
Scarcely, I think, unless we are prepared at the same time to
give up all belief in the existence of phonetic laws and the
regularity of phonetic processes. Still another word-group
may be mentioned here. It is well known that the phrase
dí vostrám fidem has acquired an accent of its own (*Trans.
Am. Phil. Assoc.* XXXV, 39, and O. Brugman, *De iamb. sena-
rio,* 30) and it is quite evident that the abbreviated phrase
t(u)ám-fidem, used in invocation of a single god, is similarly
accented, *e.g. Au.* 692 Iunó Lucína, t(u)ám fidem; *Cu.* 196
t(u)a¹m fidém, Venus. We find also *apúd-m(e)as,* after the
model of the familiar *aputme, aputvos,* on the monument of
Caecilius (*CIL.* I, 1006, 2): hospés gratúm est, quom apúd
meas réstitístei seédes (saturnian), where *apud mĕăs,* like *apud
fŏrŭm, sine mŏdŏ* (*A.J.P.* XXV, 417) would be inadmissible.

Definite metrical proof of synizesis is also afforded by exam-
ples like the following of *eā-re, eam-rem* (I quote only a few
of the numerous cases): *Men. prol.* 37 Syracúsas de (e)á-re

rédiit; *Am.* 1087 de (e)a^1-re sígna; *Au.* 799 (e)a^1-re répu-
diúm; *Phor.* 444 quid de (e)á-re; *And.* 385 ex (e)á-re quíd
fiát; *Ep.* 565 i^{3}lle (e)am-rem ádeo; *Mer.* 926 (e)a^{1}m-rem núnc
exquírit.[1]   The dative *(e)i-réi* is inseparable in Pl., and always
dissyllabic, the only doubtful case being *Men.* 234 (Seyffert,
Stud. Pl. 25, n. 17).   Similarly *Am.* 1023 quómodo? ‖   Eo^2
modo, ut; cf. *quomodo, omnimodo, nullomodo*, etc., and *Trans.
Am. Phil. Assoc.* XXXV, 48, n. 1.   Since the demonstrative
pronouns are proclitic in general (*ib.* 36 ff.), I may cite also
Per. 194 (e)a^5 fidé; cf. also *Mer.* 74 atque (e)ā pecúnia; *Poe.* 2
ex (e)á tragoédia; *Cu.* 551 (i)i^{5}s tabéllis.   Inadmissible would
be both the dactylic word *éx-ĕă* and the dactylic foot (‿ ◡ ◡)
before the diaeresis in *Mi.* 246 né titubét, si ⟨ex⟩quíret e^{4}x
(e)a | míles;[2] cf. also *Tri.* 742 ex (e)á; *And.* 719 vérum
ex (e)ó nunc mísera.   The full iambic forms of *is* are rarely
used within the verse, and are not even very freely placed in
the verse-close (*Tri.* 405; *Ci.* 611; *Men.* 86; *Mer.* 719, 766,
869, etc.).   Finally, the weak vowel is perhaps lost entirely in
the compounds *eccum* (from *ecce eúm*), *eccam, eccos, eccas*, and,
through analogy, this loss is extended even to the new forma-
tion *eccă* (fem. sing. and nom. pl.), although in the simple we
have only *ĕă*, or, at the most, *(e)a* in elision before a long
vowel.[3]

Definite proof is also given by the word-groups which
quidem forms with possessive pronouns, and which are quite
similar to those which it forms with the dissyllabic personal
pronouns, *i.e. mihĭ-quidem* and *mĭhĭ-quidem, tibĭ-quidem* and
tĭbĭ-quidem (but not *mihi quídem, tibi quídem*).   *Quidem*,
when joined to a dissyllabic word, has of course no power of

---

[1] Apart from the very frequent *composita ăd-ĕam-rem, ŏb (proptĕr) ĕam-rem,*
— cf. *hĭc-ĕam-rem* (*Au.* 201),— the full acc. *ĕam-rem* occurs in Pl. only in bacch.
verse (*Mo.* 88 ; *Cap.* 502), and once in iambic (*Ru. prol.* 19, cf. Ter. *And.* 442).

[2] Similarly Bömer, *l.l.*, 42, quotes two verses from Terence in which the forms
ĭ(u)ā and *ĭ(u)īs* are necessary in order to avoid a dactylic foot before the diaere-
sis : *Phor.* 1016 nám neque néglegéntia^4 t(u)a | néque ; *ib.* 543 nón triúmpho,
ex náptii^{4}s t(u)is | sí.

[3] Stowasser's derivation of *eccum* from *ecc' hum* is, however, usually accepted
at present, and may well be correct, especially as *eum* is not really monosyllabic.

shortening it; hence, *meŭmquidem* — the scansion which
Luchs inadvertently adopts in his discussion (*Comment pros.
Pl.* I, 16 ff.) — is impossible as a regular verse-accentuation
in the place of *meúm-quidem.* Luchs cites four examples in
which the possessive has trimoric value (*e.g.* mĕắ-quidem
hércle caúsa, *Men.* 727; *Ru.* 139; *Poe.* 573; *Ru.* 737), but
twenty-two cases of dimoric value: m(e)úm-quidém, *Tru.*
963; m(e)úm-quidem édepol, *As.* 190; m(e)ó-quidem ánimo,
Au. 478; *Ba.* 102; *Cas.* 570; *Cu.* 499, 514; *Men.* 200; *Mer.* 314;
Poe. 232; *Ru.* 1038; *Au.* 539; cf. *Ba.* 394;[1] m(e)ā-quidém sen-
téntiá, *Cas.* 563; *Men.* 81; *Poe.* 1338; m(e)ā̆-quidem, *As.* 275;
Men. 1029; *Per.* 537; *Tru.* 560; t(u)ā̆-quidem, *Men.* 792;
s(u)ám-quidem, *Mo.* 894. A similar accent is shown by the
composita which the possessives form with *sibi, mihi, e.g. suŏ-
sibī, meā-mihī;* cf. the references given in my article *A.J.P.*
XXV, 407, and also Ribbeck, *Com. Frgm.*[2], *Coroll.* xxxiv.
Thus we find fully sŭŏ́-sibi, *Cap.* 81, and even in the nom. sing.
tuós tibi sérvos, *Ba.* 994, although the accents *meús, tuós* are
otherwise almost entirely unknown. The usual scansion, how-
ever, is *s(u)ŏ́-sibī, m(e)ā̆-mihī, e.g. Tru.* 698; *Cap. prol.* 46,
50; *Per.* 81; *Poe. prol.* 57, 487; *As.* 825; *Am.* 269; cf.
Ad. 958, etc.

Further Illustrations from Possessive Pronouns. — It seems
necessary at this point, even at the risk of repeating former
statements and of making my discussion seem needlessly dif-
fuse, that I should fully explain the inferences which I draw
from the facts mentioned in the previous section. The argu-
ment which is based upon the occurrence in the γένος διπλά-
σιον of twenty-two cases of tetramoric *tuam-rem* to one case
of pentamoric *tŭām-rem* may be stated as follows: Whatever
occurred in tetramoric *tuam-rem*, was evidently very accept-
able to the dramatists; for they used the results of the
process with the greatest freedom. It is true that they
have these words in other arrangements, and that *tuam . . .
rem* occurs seven times, *rem tuam* ten times (including six

---

[1] Of doubtful correctness is the scansion of ed. min. *Ep.* 111 e³s m(e)ŏ́quidem
ánimo.

cases in the verse-close), and *rem . . . tuam* eleven times (in verse-close only), yet *tuam-rem* remains the regular and the preferred order, and it is clear that the dramatists have made no special effort to separate the two words by a very free use of tmesis-forms, such as they sometimes employ for metrical convenience, *e.g.* in the case of *manu emittere, animum advortere, magno opere, quapropter.*[1] We have seen, however, that the process cannot be shortening (p. 187); hence, two conclusions follow : (1) The process employed is synizesis. (2) The frequency of its occurrence shows that synizesis was a favorite use of common speech. It is clear also that the approximate pretonic syncope which is seen in the phrase was first produced through the prose accent *t(u)ám-rem*, but after this syncope was once definitely produced in the spoken language, it became possible to employ also the verse-accent *t(u)am-rém*, without affecting in any way the result. On the other hand, when *meam* stood last in the prose sentence, as in *curo rem meam*, there could be no slurring, but only the full pronunciation of the form, *e.g.* *mĕām*, in this non-proclitic position, and this remained the case also at the close of a metrical sentence.

Before I enter upon the discussion of other cases of slurring in the sentence, it will be necessary to speak briefly of the position of the possessive in O. Lat., and especially of its position with nouns denoting relationship, since I shall draw my illustrations chiefly from nouns of this class. In classical prose, the possessive is usually placed after its substantive, but, for greater emphasis, may be placed before it (Albrecht, *De adiectivi collocat.*, Marburg, 1890, p. 8 ff.). Nilsson, however, in his careful study, *Quomodo pronomina ap. Pl. et Ter. collocentur*, Lund, 1901, p. 13 ff., has shown that this rule does not hold good for O. Lat., and that while the possessive has really no preferred or definite position in O. Lat., yet, like the adjective, it tends to retain its original position

---

[1] Or in the case of *verumtamen* (Seyffert, *Bursian's Jahresb.* 1894, 317), *nemo homo* (Asmus, *De apposit. collocat.* 21), *quidem hercle* (Kellerhoff, *Studem. Stud.* II, 64), etc.

immediately before the substantive.[1]   This is especially true
with nouns denoting relationship (*pater, mater, gnatus, filius,
frater, vir,* etc.), both in cases where the expression of the
possessive is necessary for clearness, and even in cases where
it is quite superfluous (Nilsson, *l.l.,* 28, 15, 31).[2]   Hence,
when we take into account the influence of the verse-close
in often favoring the postpositive possessive, as in *frātrem
meum, gnātum meum, māter mea,* it seems probable that in
O. Lat. the possessive more frequently preceded nouns of
relationship.   In any case, for a typical sentence, such as ' I
saw my son,' it will be sufficient, for the purpose of this
discussion, to consider three principal positions : (1) *meum
gnatum vidi,* — the original position, which is still largely
retained in O. Lat., and is especially fitted for emphasis ;
(2) *gnatum meum vidi,* — the more usual position in classical
prose, which is well-established also in O. Lat. ; (3) *gnatum
vidi mĕūm,* — a position almost exclusively poetical, and em-
ployed chiefly for metrical convenience (Nilsson, *l.l.,* 9, 41 ff.).

---

[1] Omitting the vocative case, and omitting *noster, voster,* the possessive,
according to Nilsson, immediately precedes in 1023 cases in Pl. and Ter., im-
mediately follows in 895 cases.   For the traditional position of the possessive
before its subst., cf. Delbrück, *Syntakt. Forsch.* III, 35, § 9.

[2] With nouns denoting relationship, the *unemphatic* pronoun, according to
Nilsson (*l.l.,* 28, 31), precedes in some 215 cases, follows in some 232 cases (*l.l.,*
35, 36).   I may add some statistics of my own : The possessive immediately pre-
cedes the case-forms *gnati, gnato, gnatum* in twenty-two cases, immediately
follows in nineteen, sixteen of the latter being in verse-closes.   The poss. pre-
cedes the case-forms *patris, patri, patrem, patre* in thirty-three cases, follows in
seven cases, where the disproportion is partly, but by no means wholly, due to
the avoidance of the diiambus.   The poss. precedes the case-form *uxorem* in six
cases, follows in twenty-two, twenty of the latter being in verse-closes.   As is
implied in these figures, metrical convenience is an important factor in determin-
ing the position of the poss. — Interesting in this connection is the explanation
given by Köhm, *Altlateinische Forsch.,* Leipzig, 1905, p. 128 ff., of the phonetic
problem *gnatus-natus.*   It is well known that in O. Lat. the *g* is regularly
retained in the substantive, but lost in the participle.   According to Wessner's
review in *Berl. philol. Wochenschr.,* 1906, 843 f., Köhm has shown that the
possessive was regularly expressed with the substantive *gnatus* and usually
preceded it ; " so entstand eine eng verbundene Wortgruppe, in der *gn* zum
Inlaut wurde, so dass es sich hier ebenso erhielt wie in *prognatus, ignotus, cog-
nomen* u. dgl."   Köhm's statistics for the use of the possessive with *gnatus,
pater,* etc., I have not seen.

Both the first and the second examples cited above pre-
sent a difficult quantitative sequence ($\cup \_ \angle$), but we have
already seen in our discussion of *tuam-rem* that synizesis is a
favorite usage; hence, if phonetic laws and phonetic pro-
cesses have any meaning, the slurred pronunciation naturally
arises in common speech both in *m(e)um gnátum* and in
m(e)um vídi, and after this pronunciation has once been
established in prose, we may freely accent in verse *m(e)úm
gnatúm, m(e)úm vidí.* Further, although the difficult se-
quences that produce synizesis, viz. $\cup \_ \angle$, $\cup \_ \diamond$, do not
occur in every phrase that contains an iambic possessive, it
is clear that they occur in the great majority of cases. The
question of sentence-accent in its relation to the possessives
requires perhaps to be more fully explained. We should
not, in any ordinary case, speak of such a sentence as *meum
gnátum vidi* as containing three distinct accents. While the
word *meum* has no doubt an accent when pronounced alone,
yet in its ordinary unemphatic use in the sentence such a
pronoun has little appreciable separate accent, except in
those cases where it receives one through forming part of
a word-group (*e.g.* *tuám-rem*).[1] Thus the grammarians
never weary of stating that pronouns, conjunctions, and
prepositions ordinarily have the grave accent; cf. Schöll, *De
acc. linguae Lat.* 169 ff., and especially the straightforward
and wholly credible account of Audax, Keil, VII, 360 : non
omnes partes orationis aequales sunt. nam nomen et verbum

---

[1] Similarly, adverbs like *male, bene, cito, modo,* pronominal adverbs like *ibi,
ubi,* pronouns like *ego, mihi, tibi, sibi,* conjunctions like *tamĕn, enim,* preposi-
tions like *apŭd,* have their final syllable shortened in speech not so much in
consequence of their own accent, which, in most of their uses, is usually not an
appreciable one, but through the force of the accent of some neighboring word
with which they are grouped in sentence-phrasing, *e.g.* in collocations like *bene-
fáctum, ibi vídeo, tibi cónsulo, apŭd villam.* Of course, after such subordinate
words have been shortened in common speech, they may be used to form a re-
solved arsis, and so freely receive the *metrical* accent upon the first syllable, *e.g.*
tĭbĭ, bĕnĕ, mălĕ (these latter adverbs, for example, showing in the Romance
languages not only tonic forms like Ital. *biene,* Fr. *bien* and *mel,* but also atonic
forms like Ital. *bene,* Fr. *ben* and *mal*). In this whole question of the shorten-
ing of iambic words through sentence-phrasing, I cannot refrain from expressing
my agreement with Lindsay's admirable discussions (*L.L.* 210; *Captivi,* 30 ff.),

et participium ínter partes omnes excellunt ; cetera his ad-
pendices videntur. nam et pronomen subiacet nomini, et
verbo servit adverbium. coniunctio quoque et praepositio ad
clientelam maiorum partium pertinent. hae ergo partes, quae
adpendices sunt, sic maioribus copulantur, ut . . . proprium
fastigium perdant, non omnes dumtaxat, sed pleraeque. A
similar view is held by modern students of the possessive,
e.g. Nilsson, *l.l.*, 12 : " Hoc dubium non est, quin pronomina
possessiva, nisi vis peculiaris adderetur, perparva vocis inten-
tione pronuntiata sint." In short, I am at a loss to see how,
in the Latin sentence, one can ever get a very appreciable
accent upon the first syllable of an iambic pronoun in any of
its ordinary and unemphatic uses, that is, the usages which
constitute the great bulk of its occurrences in the sentence,
and precisely the same lack of accent, which has made the
long penult of *ille, nempe, nēquis*, a half-long, has caused the
short penult in hiatus of *meo, tuo, eo*, to become a negligible
short. The early history of the possessive forms in Latin
points to the same conclusion. For the original O. Lat.
forms *tovos* and *sovos* were reduced to *tuos, suos* 'wegen der
häufigen tieftonigen oder enklitischen Stellung,' [1] as Stolz (*l.l.*,
33, 101) observes ; and, as in this case only the atonic forms
remained in use,[2] so it is reasonable to suppose that O. Lat.
pronunciation, in further reducing iambic forms of the posses-
sives, took into account only their chief or atonic use.[3]

and from pointing out how great an advance is here made upon such earlier ex-
planations of the iambic law, as *e.g.* that of Brix, *Einl. zu Trin.* 15 ff., which men-
tions only the difficulty of pronouncing single iambic words, or that of Havet, *De
Saturnio*, 26 ff., which needlessly assumes the existence of initial intensity. See
also the excellent remarks of Skutsch (*Sat. Viadr.* 128 f., Γέρας, 128) upon the
causes of iambic shortening, which as a rule depends much more on the accent
of the adjoining word and, consequently, upon sentence-accent than upon the
accent of the iambic word itself. *Thus the accent of the iambic word alone is as
a rule insufficient either to cause shortening or to prevent slurring.*

[1] With Lat. *tovos* and *tuos*, cf. Oscan *súvad* and *suveís*, Umbrian *touer* and *tuer*
(Buck, *Gramm. of Osc.* 140); for examples of O. Lat. *tovos, sovos*, cf. Lindsay,
L.L. 428.

[2] Cf. Sommer, *Lat. Lautlehre*, 449 : " die unbetonte Form *suos*."

[3] Cf. Seelmann, *Ausspr. d. Lat.* 187 : " Der ganzen latinität gemein ist der
zug, betontes Ĕ oder *e* vor vocalen zu *ͤ*, unbetontes zu halbvocalischem *i̯* werden

A possible objection must be noticed here. In addition to the frequent proclitic possessive, there is of course the occasional emphatic possessive, seen in such a sentence as '*méum gnatum, non túom* (or *nón-tuom*) *vidi*,' and this emphatic or accented possessive is represented in the Romance language by Fr. *mien*, Ital. *mio*, Span. *mio, tuyo, suyo*, while the atonic forms are represented by Fr. *mon, ma*, Ital. *mo, ma*, Span. *mi, tu, su*.[1] Certainly it must be said that no emphatic possessive, no emphatic *deum* or *scio* or *fūi originally* had its first syllable unaccented and slurred,[2] yet after the slurred sentence-

zu lassen. Hierher gehören die bekannten parallelformen in der declination vom deus meus und vom pronomen is. Inschriftlich z. b. MIEIS CIL. I, 38; DIO *ib. Iun.* 4; DIA *ib.* IX, 4178; TIVDOSI *ib.* X, 6936 . . . Selbst das ·betonte secundäre ͡e war so flüchtiger natur, dass es ungeschrieben, vielleicht auch ungesprochen bleiben konnte, cf. THVDOSIO Rossi 519 (403 n. Chr.), DO CIL. VII, 181, 751; DAE *ib.* 234, 273."

[1] Professor C. C. Marden, whom I have consulted, kindly informs me that atonic *mi* is derived by the best authorities (Cornu, Menéndez Pidal) from O. Span. *mie, mia*, and so from an original dissyllabic *meum*. It is interesting to find that the *tonic* forms of early Spanish and Portuguese show a development somewhat similar to that of the O. Lat. pronoun ; for Professor Marden kindly calls my attention to the fact that in O. Span. poetry, until the second half of the thirteenth century, *mio* was very frequently used in proclitic positions with monosyllabic value, *e.g. mi͡o ͡cid*, etc., and that O. Port. *mia* also occurs sporadically as *mi͡a ;* see Cornu, *Romania*, XIII, 307 ff. There is also evidence to show that Span. proclitic *mio* was pronounced *mi͡ó*, the slurring resulting in a rising diphthong. In Italian poetry, the hiatus vowels not only of *io, mio, tuo, lui, dio*, but of *obblio, eroi, cortesia*, etc., are regularly slurred, *except at the end of the verse* (Blanc, *Gramm. d. ital. Sprache*, 867 f.); cf. the Latin usage in the case of verses which end in an iambus. — Gröber (*A.LL.* I, 221) would limit the diphthongal pronunciation in Romance to accented vowel + *i* or *u, e.g. cu͡i, tu͡i, fu͡i, me͡um, de͡um*, and the loss of the first vowel in Romance to unaccented vowel (in proclitic and enclitic use) + *a, e.g. m[e]am, m[e]as* (on the tonic and atonic Romance forms of the possessives, cf. also Meyer-Lübke, *Gramm. d. roman. Spr.* II, 108 ; III, 775). There was synizesis then in Romance, but it did not obey precisely the same laws as in O. Lat. The difference is by no means surprising, since the sentence rhythm of Romance was in part quite different from that of O. Lat.; cf. the principle of binary accentuation as seen in *impèratórem* (Riemann and Gölzer, *Grammaire Comparée*, I, 84 ; Havet, *Métr.*[4] § 498). I fear that Exon forgets this difference of period when he proposes (*Class. Rev.* 1906, 31 ff.) the accentuation *exŏněrátus* for O. Lat , which is disproved both by the O. Lat. principle of recession and by the absence of proceleusmatici like *sed ěxŏnerátús.*

[2] This statement is true, however, only if by 'emphatic' is meant 'the most

forms *m(e)um, d(e)um, sc(i)o, f(u)i* had once become estab-
lished in the great majority of cases in consequence of the
weak use of the possessive, the trite use of *deum*, the paren-
thetical use of *scio*, the atonic use of the substantive verb,
and the like, then even the emphatic forms ceased at this
stage of the development to be *méum, déum, scío, fúi*, and
easily became *m(e)úm, d(e)úm, sc(i)ó, f(u)í*,[1] both in common
speech and in verse, *e.g. Cas.* 89 non míhi licére m(e)ám rem
mé solum út voló | Loqui; *Cap.* 632; *Mi.* 951, 1117; *Poe.*
675, etc.; *Cap.* 879 m(e)u³m⟨ne⟩ gnátum ? ‖ T(u)o⁵m gnatum
ét geniúm meúm. Since, however, in writing verse — often
even in writing accentual verse like our own — little account
is taken of logical emphasis (cf. Christ, *Metr.*² 61), and a fair
compromise between rhythmical and rhetorical accent is left
almost entirely to the reader, we are as likely to find in such
cases the verse-accent *t(u)om gnátum* as *t(u)óm gnatúm, e.g.*
Ru. 1071 qui⁵ t(u)om pótiust quám meúm? 1063 álienón
prius | Qua¹m t(u)o dábis orátiónem ? See also the examples
of this kind collected by Nilsson, *l.l.*, 1, who rightly con-
cludes that the question of the coincidence of rhythmical and
logical accent is one that yields no results.[2]

Some statistics of usage may be given. Where the pos-
sessive immediately precedes the case-forms *gnatum, gnati,
gnato*, it is quasi-monosyllabic in nineteen cases, dissyllabic
in three (*Cap.* 976; *Ps.* 1072; *And.* 535). Synizesis occurs
quite as naturally, but not so frequently, when the possessive
follows its substantive but precedes some other accented
word: *St.* 274 patrí | S(u)o núntium; *Hau.* 402 patrém

1

emphatic'; for, *since the sentence determines the relative importance of the ac-
cents of individual words*, any emphatic word may be slurred from the first,
provided a still more emphatic word stands in immediate proximity to it. For
the influence of the sentence-accent in the slurring of paroxytone substantives
and verbs, such as *deo, die, scio*, see more fully the supplement to the present
article, which will appear in *Classical Philology*, II, No. 5.

[1] Cf. the weakening seen in atonic *simus* (Mar. Victor. 9, 5 K.) for *sumus*.

[2] Cf. examples (discussed *A.J.P.* XXV, 270) like *Men.* 1085 f. Nón egó ‖
Át egŏ; *Mo.* 364 (twice) ét ego ét tu ; *Cap.* 623, 981 aút ego aút tu, where the
metrical treatment is unified, and see the striking collection of examples in
Müller's *Nachträge*, 126 f. Lindsay, *Capt.* 366 f., and Ritschl, *Proleg.* ch. xvi,
are not sufficiently cautious at this point.

t(u)om vídi; *Hec.* 516 viró m(e)o re⁷spondébo, As has
already been stated (p. 192), the possessive usually precedes
pater, and there can be little doubt that in the nom. sing.,
when a pyrrhic pronoun is prefixed, *méu(s) pater* was usually
pronounced under one accent, according to the preferred
rhythm (rhythmic grouping) ◡◡, ◡‒ (*A.J.P.* XXV, 160,
260, n. 1; cf. also Lindsay, *Captivi*, 369, and the frequent
mé(um) erum, etc.). In the case of the iambic possessive,
however, an accent *meúm patrem* arises much less easily, and
it is not clear that any regular word-order exists in the case
of the possessive;[1] the assumption of a recessive accent, how-
ever, is wholly unnecessary, since syncope is produced equally
by the original accent *meum pátrem*. It is quite probable that
the accent recedes freely upon quasi-monosyllabic *m(e)um*,
but, in any case, the verse-treatment is *m(e)úm-patrém*, never
meum pátr(em). Thus the dramatists have *m(e)úm patrém*,
m(e)ó patrí, *m(e)í-patrís*, *m(e)ó-patré* with synizesis thirty-

---

[1] Nor is *patrem meum* a traditional word-order in O. Lat.; hence I agree
thoroughly with Wallstedt, who in his good article, *Zur Betonung des Posses-
sivums*, Lund, 1906, concludes from the usual avoidance of *pátrém-meum, mănú-
mea*, etc., in verse-closes that such phrases were not regularly accented as single
words; for a similar hint, cf. *Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc.* XXXV, 49. (I may add
that Wallstedt (p. 27 ff.) evidently accepts all the results of my own special
articles, although the criticism made on p. 28 shows that in part he misunder-
stands my actual views; thus I do *not* deny the existence of an actual but less
usual accent *quod fácis*, etc., cf. *A.J.P.* XXV, 411 ff.; for coalescence in pro-
nunciation, he should see *ib.* 160 ff.) As further confirming Wallstedt's conclu-
sions, I should like to point out that *spondaic* words, followed by the possessive,
are not allowed in the inner feet or in the critical feet of iambic verse, *i.e.* we do
not find *fratrém-meum* nor *fratrém-meum*, as we should most certainly do, if
meum were regularly enclitic. Especially may one object to the word-group
volŭptás-mea, which is so often confidently assumed (Klotz, *Grundz.* 92; Lind-
say, *Capt.* 367); this accent could only arise from a usual word-order, but the
usual order with the vocative case, in fact *the invariable prose order*, is *mea
voluptas* (cf. *mi pater, mi patrone*, etc.), which Pl. retains 12 times, using *volup-
tas mea* 7 times only for metrical convenience (cf. Ferger, *De vocativi usu Pl.*,
Strassburg, 1889, p. 17). For the well-known rule of order with the vocative,
see Ferger, *l.l.*, 18, 14 (*e.g.* "pronomina, si per metrum licet, ante vocativum
ponuntur, neque nisi metro repugnante vocativus praecedit"), and Nilsson, *l l.*,
12, 34. In fact, *volĕptás, molěstaé*, with accent on the *ultima* were probably
not much more displeasing to a Roman ear than *rĕgnŭm;* much harsher seems
the rare accentuation of the *initial* syllable, as in *dĕdĭsse, bĭbĭsti.*

three times, *mĕúm patrém* without synizesis only once (*Ba.*
380).[1] This thoroughgoing synizesis is by no means wholly
due to the avoidance of the double iambus; for, in the order
patrém meúm, patrí meó, they employ the diiambus five times
(*Men.* 747, 750; *Tri.* 280; *St.* 10; *Cap.* 1012), and the treat-
ment with elision, *e.g. patrí me͡(o)⏜*, twice (*Cap.* 318, 377).
Phrases like *mĕúm-patrém* do not, however, occur in verse-
closes, since they almost never occur without synizesis in any
case, and also because the group-accent *m(e)úm-patrem* arises
only through synizesis; cf., however, Naev. *tr. fr.* 13 quin
mĕá-manú | Moriáre, where the correction of R³ (mea móri-
arís manú) seems unnecessary. Similarly the dramatists
have *m(e)ám-fidem* six times and *m(e)úm-virum* nine times,
always with synizesis; in the opposite order the diiambus
virúm suóm occurs perhaps *St.* 284. The influence of met-
rical convenience or of a preferred rhythm in giving value to
the weak vowel is well seen in *meàm-senténtiam*, which
shows synizesis six times, non-synizesis twice, and in *àd-
mĕàm-senténtiam*, which retains its full form twice (*Au.* 383;
Poe. 1126).

My conclusion is that thoroughgoing synizesis is certain in
meo, suo, fui, deo, diu, and occasional synizesis in *scio, die;*
and I accept fully the views of Götz and Schöll (ed. min. *fascic.*
II, vi): " non *mĕó, sŭó* sim. probamus, quod non una re firmari
putamus," and of Corssen, *Ausspr.* II², 750: " Die Meinungs-
äusserungen von C. Müller über die Synizese stehen im
Widerspruch zu den Lehren der Grammatiker, zu dem Zeug-
niss der lateinischen Schrift, zu den Lautgesetzen der latein-
ischen Sprache." (Cf. Leppermann, *l.l.*, 81.)[2]

---

[1] I omit entirely *Trag. fr. inc. inc.* 216 (sŭúm patrém), because of its uncer-
tain date. The citations for synizesis are as follows: *M(e)úm patrem:* *Cap.*
238, 1024, 1032; *Ep.* 349, 374; *Men.* 736; *Mer.* 787; *Mo.* 979; *Tri.* 1178;
Phor. 874; *Pacuv. tr. fr.* 139.—*M(e)ó patri:* *Am.* 144; *Ba.* 685, 731, 734;
Cap. prol. 21, 237, 588, 923, 979, 987; *Mer.* 80, 631, 954; *Hau.* 259; *Hec.*
820, 865.—*M(e)í patris* (final *s* making position): *Am.* 31; (*Mo.* 1125); *Eu*
1048; *Phor.* 788.—*M(e)ó patre:* *Ba.* 931; *Men.* 1079; *Hau.* 823.

[2] It will be observed that it is quite possible to treat Plautine synizesis, as I
have in fact treated it throughout this whole section, in entire dependence upon
the teachings of the *metrici* respecting the value of syllables, since they have, in

Later Usage. — The use of synizesis had been very extended in O. Lat., but a complete change of attitude took place in the later literary language. A more precise system of pronunciation was accepted both by writers of verse and of rhythmical prose, and a consistent body of theoretical principles was formulated. Hence the Augustan poets sought to reduce both shortening and slurring within the narrowest limits possible, and to confine these processes to a limited circle of words. But of the two processes they naturally viewed with much greater toleration that which involved the actual shortening of syllables; as refined and tasteful artists, they could not but regard the frequent slurring of syllables as vulgar and incorrect. Hence while they admitted (at least theoretically) the consonantization of the vowels *i(e)* and *u*, they rejected almost entirely the slurring of these sounds, and preferred, through a strengthened pronunciation of the first vowel, to introduce *sciŏ, nesciŏ-quis* (Cat. 6, 4; Hor. *C.* iii, 24, 64), *dĭŏ, dĭŭturnus, dĭŭtius*, etc., in place of O. Lat. *sc(i)ō, nesc(i)ōquis*,[1] *dvō* or *d(u)ō* (cf. Gk. δυώδεκα and δώδεκα),[2] *d(i)ūtius* (cf. *d(i)ūdum*); cf. also the introduction of the forms *dĕi, dĕis* in this period (Sturtevant, *l.l.*, 21), and the restoration of *nihil, prehendo, hercule, mehercule* in place of O. Lat. *nil, prendo, hercle, mehcrcle*. Moreover, the poets of the empire, such as Seneca, Martial, Juvenal, and Statius, followed the guidance of analogy and the trend of careful pro-

---

fact, provided for exceptionally short syllables through the prosodical figure Synizesis. For this reason some of the preliminary remarks contained in the first section of this paper seem to me now somewhat unnecessary, although the ancient metricians may be justly criticised for not distinguishing more clearly between the natural and the artificial forms of synizesis.

[1] But see above, p. 174, n. 2 (end); to examples of the restored vowel should be added the frequent *dŭellum* of Horace (*C.* iii, 5, 38; 14, 18, etc.).

[2] According to Studemund, *A.L.L.* III, 550 f., *duo* is very nearly *dvō* in the dramatists, that is, in the nom. masc., where it is the sole form, Pl. allows it to end an iambic line (*dŭō*), but in the acc. masc., where the form *duōs* also exists, he treats it as a monosyllable (*dvō*) and uses the form *duōs* instead at the end of a line. From this use it is probable that *duo* was more nearly one syllable than two in Plautus's time; cf. also Lindsay, *L.L.* 411. There are two exceptions to the rule, *i.e.* two cases of acc. *dŭō* in verse-closes: *Ep.* 187; *Ps.* 1000. An original *dŭŏ*, which would not admit synizesis, is improbable; cf. late *duŏ*.

nunciation, as it existed throughout this entire period, when they resolved the synizesis-diphthong *ui* in *cui, cuicumque* (earlier *quoii, quoiicumque*), and *huic* into *cŭĭ, cŭĭcumque,* and *hŭĭc;* see examples in L. Müller, *R.M.*², 318 f. ; Neue, II³, 454. Hence, after the period of Lucilius, Lucretius, and Varro (cf. L. Müller, *l.l.,* 546), we find only those forms freely slurred by the dactylic poets which present especial difficulty in hexameter verse, *e.g. eidem* (dat. sing.), *eodem, eaedem, eosdem,*[1] and of other slurred forms we find only a few isolated examples, viz. : dat. sing. *(e)i* regularly in Cicero's *clausulae* (Zielinski, *Clauselgesetz,* 176),[2] and once in Catullus (82, 3), *m(e)is* (Sen. *Troad.* 191), *s(u)āpte* (*id. Agam.* 250), *(i)ō* (Cat. 61, 124 ff. ; Mart. xi, 2, 5),[3] *v(i)ētis* (Hor. *Epod.* 12, 7, — dactylic), *(I)ūle* (*id. C.* iv, 2, 2 — sapphic ; cf. L. Müller, *l.l.,* 307), *S(u)ēvo* (Prop. iv, 2 (3), 45), etc. Similarly, there is reason to believe that the more dignified poets entertained some prejudice against the forms of the pronoun *is,* on account of their frequent slurring, and although they accepted fully the contract forms *di, dis, īdem* (nom. pl.), *īsdem,* they seem to have especially avoided the nom. and abl. pl. of *is.*[4] According to Meader-Wölfflin, *A.L.L.* XI, 373, dissyllabic *ei* and *eis* are represented in the poets only by the group-form *ĭn-ĕis,* Manil. ii, 744,[5] and whether monosyllabic *i* and *īs* were allowed at all, is a question still under discussion (Meader, *Latin Pronouns,* 23).

In the remains of popular poetry, however, and in later poets like Terentianus Maurus and Ausonius (L. Müller, 322), colloquial synizesis forms occur much more freely, and it is evident from late inscriptional forms like *so, tis, quescas,* etc., that they were always retained in vulgar Latin, although the distinction between consonant and vowel *i* and *u* probably

---

[1] All the examples are collected by Skutsch, Γέρας, 148.

[2] Dat. sing. *ei* was almost as much a monosyllable in Priscian's time as *huic* and *cui;* cf. Keil, III, 10, 2 ff.

[3] Cf. Munro, *Criticisms and Elucidations of Catullus,* Cambridge, 1878, 135 ff.

[4] Cf. L. Müller, *l.l.,* 297.

[5] Similarly trisyllabic *eidem* and *eisdem* are represented only by the rhythmical groups *sē¹d-ĕidem,* Pl. *Mi.* 758 (Sturtevant, *l.l.,* 25), and *dăt-ĕisdem,* Juv. xiv, 30 (L. Müller, *l.l.,* 297).

became more marked as time went on.[1] Especially well known is the late Latin tendency for *di*, when followed by a vowel, to assume the spirant sound of *y* (Lindsay, *L.L.* 49, 84), and to be written at times *z* or *d*, *e.g. des CIL.* V, 6244; 2(*es*), *ib.*, 1667; *do, dae* (Schuchardt, *Vok. des Vulgärlat.* II, 463; III, 289; Bücheler, *Lex. It.* vii; Seelmann, *Ausspr. d. Lat.* 187); cf. Oscan *zicolom* for **dieculom*. The beginnings of this tendency, especially in hiatus before a long vowel, may be recognized in a few O. Lat. words, *e.g. Iūturna* from *Diū-turna*,[2] *Iovem* from O. Lat. *Diovem*, and, to a limited extent, also, in the Plautine scansions *d(e)o, d(e)ae, d(i)e,*[3] *d(i)erec-tus, D(i)espiter, d(i)u, d(i)utinus, d(i)utius, d(i)udum;* cf. also the scansions *dvellum, d(u)o, d(u)odecim, d(u)im,* and the tendency of *du* in some of these forms to pass into *d,* and later, into *b* (Stolz, Müller's *Handb.* II[3], 2, 82).

III. Additional Principles of Synizesis.

In the preceding section the vague term synizesis has been more exactly defined through the law of *Brevis Coalescens.* It remains to state very briefly, as the limits of the present article require, a few additional facts which are simple corol-laries of this law, but which, in several cases, have a bear-ing upon the general subject of classical synizesis and the limitations to which it is subject.

(1) **Two Short Vowels Preserved Intact.** — Word-forms in which two short vowels come together, *e.g. mĕŭ(s), mĕă, fŭĕrit,* are not subject to synizesis, except in those cases where the second short vowel is elided before a following long vowel, and an iambic sequence results, as in *Mo.* 98 m(e)ă, haud áliter. Hence it is scarcely necessary to discuss seriously the assumption of wholly unnecessary and gratuitous syni-

---

[1] Cf. L. Müller, *R.M.*[2], 308: "Contra in illis, quae sunt *tuus, suus,* cum initio valde fuisset exili sono littera eadem, corroboratast sensim."

[2] Cf. *Bull. d. ist. arch.* 1871, 136 f. The two forms, however (like *Diāna* and *Iāna, Diānus* and *Iānus*), are perhaps connected only by popular etymology; cf. Stolz, *Hist. Gramm.* 305. For the treatment of *di* in hiatus in the Pelignian dialect, cf. Lindsay, *L.L.* 49.

[3] Cf. *dibus, CIL.* VI, 25540, for *diēbus.*

zesis forms such as *myŭs*, *myă*, *yă*, or such as *tūŏs*, *mēus*, *mēā*, *ēā*;[1] such strange and abortive forms are rejected at the present day by all careful critics (*e.g.* Lindsay, *L.L.* 439, 426; Ahlberg, *De procel.* I, 88 ff., 154), and, in accordance with Spengel's well-considered views (*Einl. zu Andria*, xxxi, n. 3), synizesis is confidently restricted to those cases in which a short vowel is 'subordinated' to a following long one.[2] Thus, with reference to the supposed form *mēus, eu* is not a regular Latin diphthong, but is of secondary origin in *seu*, *neu*, and the result of reduction from *sive, neve;* even in the case of genuine compounds, *neutiquam* is pronounced *nyutiquam*, *nĕŭter* is regularly a trisyllable (Consentius, Keil, V, 389, 28), etc. A similar disproof might be given of the other supposed combinations also, which in no case involve the contraction of qualitatively similar vowels such as is seen in *nēmo, dēsse, dēbeo, nīl, cōnesto*, etc. Further, *pūri*, Lucr. iv, 1026, does not represent *pŭĕri*, as L. Müller supposes (*R.M.*[2] 298), but must be referred to the adj. *pūrus*, as Munro has shown;[3] *pŭĕrĭtĭem*, Auson. *Prof.* 10, 17, is not to be explained as a case of synizesis, but is a proceleusmaticus used in place of a dactyl, since resolution of the arsis is sometimes allowed in both the early and the late hexameter, *e.g.* Enn. *A.* 267 M. cápitibu(s); *CIL.* I, 542 fácilia fáxseis; cf. Priscian, Keil, II, 14; Christ, *Metr.*[2] 145; Exon, *Hermathena*, XIII, 157 f. Finally, it may be added that examples of iambic *mĕŭs, tuŏs*, with final *s* making position, are excessively rare in the dramatists, *e.g. Hau.* 219 non út mĕūs, qui (Fleck.: non út mĕūst, qui).

---

[1] These last are retained in Neue, II³, 371 ff., no doubt through lack of careful revision.

[2] Similarly the Augustan poets do not admit synizesis in the case of two short vowels unless the second is long by position or by pause, *e.g.* Verg. *Ecl.* vi, 30, *Orph(e)ā*, where the short *a* is lengthened by pause ; cf. also L. Müller, *Einl. zu Sat. des Horaz*, xxvii, § 3. Hence *dein* and *proin*, which always show synizesis, occur only before consonants (Skutsch, *Forsch.* 87 ff.; Birt, *Rhein. Mus.* LI, 267 f.).

[3] Similarly it is almost sheer wantonness for L. Müller to interpret *pūre* as *puere* in Lucil. xxvi, 83 M., where Marx now reads (xxvi, 662) : laútum e ménsa púrē cápturús cibúm.

(2) **Synizesis in Cases of Elision.** — Synizesis occurs both when the iambic sequence is contained in a single word, as in *tuō*, and when, as the result of elision, it is contained in two words, as in *t͡(u͡)o a͡rbitrátu, Cap.* 867 (for numerous other examples, see C. Müller, *Pl. Pr.* 457 ff.). In the first class of cases, the use of synizesis is relatively more frequent, and occurs with the possessives, as we have seen, about nine times as frequently as the dissyllabic measurement. In cases of the second class, however, where a small fragment of the 'bruised' vowel is doubtless retained in pronunciation and intervenes between the two syllables of the iambic sequence, the employment of synizesis is only twice as frequent as the dissyllabic measurement; thus *m(e)o, t(u)o, s(u)o arbitratu* occur in Pl. twelve times, *mĕo arbitratu* occurs six times; *m(e)am uxorem* occurs seven times, *mĕam uxorem* four times. The examples of supposed *mĕa ŭxor*, which are cited by Ahlberg, *De corrept. Pl.* 70, should be read *m(e)a ŭxor*, as is necessary in *Am.* 522 m(e)a u⁴xor. For *qu(i)a* in elision, cf. p. 180, n. 3.

(3) **Principle of C. F. W. Müller: Total Elision of Synizesis Forms not Allowable before a Short Syllable.** — Müller correctly observed (*Pl. Pr.* 457 f.) that a combination like *meo ănimo* is *necessarily* always read as tetrasyllabic in early Latin verse; since then a combination like *meo ārbitratu* may always, or almost always, be *conceivably* pentasyllabic, *i.e.* read as *mĕo ārbitratu*, he concluded that the supposed monosyllabic forms never suffer 'total elision,' and are therefore never really treated like monosyllabic forms in any particular. Müller's conclusion, however, is manifestly lacking in logical cogency, and is not warranted by his premises. For he was only warranted in concluding with certainty that these forms do not suffer 'total elision' before a short vowel.[1] This latter is undoubtedly the case, for the vocal organs experienced no special difficulty in pronouncing the sequence *mĕo*

---

[1] Compare the careful observations of Bömer, *l.l.*, 43, in refutation of Müller's view: "Maximam offensionem huiusmodi vocabuli synalœphe cum brevi vocali habebat . . . Synaloephe cum longa vocali minus erat insueta. Loci, quales sunt *me͡a Antiphila, me͡o ārbitratu*, etc., saepius inveniuntur."

ănĭmo, and hence had no occasion to seek a special relief. Nevertheless a few apparently well-attested cases (cf. Hauler, *Einl. zu Phor.* 56, n. 6) before a short vowel are found in the whole drama, viz. *St.* 39 pól m(eo) animo ómnis (anap. dim.); 275 núnc m(eae) erăe núntiábo; *Tri.* 724; *Mi.* 262; *Poe.* 1070; *Cap.* 666; *Cas.* 542 ⁶ ⁷ (?); Titin. *tog.* 40; *Hec.* 238 (Umpf. and Dz., following A). These examples may either be rejected entirely in view of their extreme rarity (Skutsch, *Sat. Viadr.* 143; Ahlberg, *De procel.* I, 91),[1] or they may be considered as evidences of the close approach of *meō* to a genuine monosyllabic pronunciation, or — the most probable solution in my judgment — they may be interpreted, like Lucretius's *or(i)undi*, simply as cases of the total suppression of a weak semivowel in hiatus; cf. p. 169 above.

(4) **Doubtful Existence of Monosyllabic Stem *SO-.** — The statement is commonly made on the authority of Festus that, in addition to the usual forms of the possessive, there existed in O. Lat. the forms *sām, sōs, sās, sīs*, etc., and that these latter were freely used by Ennius. Comparative grammarians have been dubious about identifying these O. Lat. forms with the synizesis-results *s(u)ām, s(u)ōs*, and have preferred to connect them with the I.-Eur. monosyllabic stem *suo-*, Skt. *svá-s*, Gk. σϝό-ς, etc.; cf. Stolz, *Müller's Handb.* II³, 2, 137; Lindsay, *L.L.* 426; Sommer, *Lat. Lautlehre*, 445, § 279.[2] They have thus been led tacitly to assume the existence in historical Latin of *sŏs* and *să* in the nom. sing. as well as of *sām, sās, sōs* in the oblique cases. Unfortunately for this

---

[1] Cf. also Skutsch, Γέρας, 111.

[2] Very many scholars, however, as L. Müller, *R.M.*² 322, 297, and Neue, II³, 366, 369, 371, are content to accept the explanation *sīs* (Enn., Lucr.) = *suis; sō* (*CIL.* V, 2007) = *suo; mieis* (*CIL.* I, 38), *i.e. mīs = meis; tīs* (*Inscr. Or.* 4847) = *tuis;* cf. also Lindsay, *l.l.*, 268, and Sommer, *l.l.*, 446. The particular identifications just named are, in my judgment, undoubtedly correct. The Plautus Mss also sometimes indicate the monosyllabic pronunciation of the dat.-abl. pl. *meis* by the orthography *mieis, miis,* or *mis;* for examples, cf. Neue, II³, 366, and Sturtevant, *l.l.*, 35. In addition, we find in the vulgar language not only the barbarous form *suobus* (dat.-abl. pl.), but also *sybus* (*CIL.* VI, 26896). The latter is probably not formed after *sibi*, as Stolz (Müller's *Handb.* II³, 2, 134) suggests, but after *sis;* cf. *dibus* (*CIL.* VI, 214), formed after *dis*.

hypothesis, we find only the latter forms ascribed to Ennius, and certainly there is no trace whatever of the forms *sŏs, să* in the dramatists; for had they been in colloquial use, the Plautine plays would have been filled with examples like the following : *út sŏs-ắmícus dícerét, ut sŏs erus aúferát, út marepóscam múnerá, út sa-dĕpéndít,* cf. *út (e)ắ dixít,* etc. In other words, at the very point where the monosyllabic possessive stem might demonstrate its independent existence, no traces of it are found either in Ennius or in Pl.[1] I am led, however, to the conclusion that if the alleged literary (not vulgar) forms *săm, săs* were used by Ennius, they cannot be certainly identified with the synizesis-forms *suām, suās,* which are not absolute monosyllables, nor can they be certainly referred to Ennius's well-known attempt to introduce phonetic or quasi-phonetic principles in the writing of Latin words, as Édon, *Écriture du lat. populaire,* 82, would refer them. Yet, with the exception of the abl. pl. *sīs*[2] — an undoubted synizesis form — which is itself probably only quasi-phonetic, but is warranted by the analogy of *dīs, īs, mieis, miis, mīs, tīs* (vulgar), these alleged forms are very poorly attested and seem likely to have arisen from a palpable misinterpretation by Festus (repeated later by *Sch.* on Per. i, 108) of Enn. *A.* 102 M : Virginĕs nam sibi quisque domi Romanus habet *sas.* In commenting on this passage, Verrius Flaccus had expressly explained O. Lat. *săs* (from the *demonstrative* stem **so- *să*) as used in place of *eas,*[3] as indeed the

---

[1] The above statement should be put more strongly ; for the only monosyllabic forms which would come directly from the I.-Eur. stem **sŭŏ-,* viz. the forms *sŏs* and *sŏm,* are the missing ones. Cf. Sommer, *l.l.,* 445 : " **Sŭŏ-* musste nach § 94, 2, lateinisch in allen Formen, wo *ŏ* auf *ŭ* folgte, zu *sŏ-* werden ; diese Gestalt wurde dann durchs ganze Paradigma durchgeführt."

[2] Enn. *A.* 141 M.: Postquam lumina sis oculis bonus Ancus reliquit ; cf. Lucr. iii, 1023.

[3] Fest. 476, 17 Th.: sas Verrius putat significare eas teste Ennio qui dicit, etc., . . ., cum suas magis significare videatur. With the exception of this misinterpreted passage, Festus quotes no actual verses of Ennius for the alleged monosyllabic possessives *sam, sas, sos,* but we find the quasi-monosyllabic form spelled *suos,* in the Mss of Festus, 324, 17 Th., Paulus, 325, 6, and Nonius, 158, 20: (Dis) Poeni soliti suos sacrificare puellos (*A.* 233 M.); cf. also Lindsay, *L.L.* 429. — Verrius's interpretation of *sas* as *eas* in the passage quoted above is accepted also

sense requires, but Festus evidently misunderstood the mean-
ing of the verse, and was thus led to ascribe to Ennius false
possessive forms *sas, sos, sam*, etc.; for a similar view, see
L. Müller's note *ad loc.*

(5) **Retention of a Pair of Shorts through Logical Analogy.**
— I have already spoken of the absence of slurring in ana-
paestic groups like *sĕd-ĕĭ, ab-eis, in-eisdem* (p. 183). It should
be further noted that the monosyllabic forms *ĭ* and *ĭs* had
apparently not established themselves in all uses in the time
of Pl., *e.g.* they were not in use after a short monosyllable,
and there are no well-attested cases in the drama of *sed ĭ*
(*dícunt*), *ab ĭs* (*véniunt*), with iambic shortening. At a later
period, however — probably first in the Ciceronian age —
the simple forms and the group-forms of *is* and *idem* became
more fully assimilated; thus compare Pl. *Mi.* 758, *se¹d ⟨e⟩idém*,
with Hor. *C.* iii, 2, 27, *sŭb ísdem*, and Manil., *Astron.* iii, 73,
sémper ut (*e*)*ídem* (dat. sing.). Owing to a tendency, which is
not consistently carried out, to interpret Ms *iis* as *ís*, the ed.
min. gives here at times un-Plautine forms, but *quíd-iis*
(Mss), or *quíd-eis* is necessary *Poe.* 167, and *ut-iís* (Mss),
or *ut-eís*, should be read *Am.* 68; *Men.* 972; *Ru.* 647, etc., as
well as *in hís* (CD), *Ps.* 1109 (ed. min.: *in ís*); of very doubt-
ful scansion are *Mo.* 862, *Ps.* 1111, and the scansions of the
ed. min., *sed ĭ, neque ís*, could only be defended as a license
of anap. verse.[1]   In short, at this period all the group-forms
of *is* were trisyllabic like *sĕd-ĕō*, and the intrusion of a dissyl-

by Lachmann (on Lucr. vi, 1067) and by Vahlen in his second edition of Ennius
(Leipzig, 1903), who explains: " virgines, nam sibi quisque *eas* domi Romanus
habet, reddi non possunt." Skutsch (Γέρας, 144; Pauly-Wissowa, *Realencyclopäd.*
VI, 2625) attempts to explain *sas* as the possessive pronoun in this passage, but
characterizes this use of the word as an arbitrary and tasteless invention of
Ennius in imitation of Homeric ὅς (' eine Erfindung des Ennius . . . willkürlich
. . . krass '). This supposition, which confessedly does little honor to Ennius, is
also quite unnecessary; it had been ·put forward before by L. Müller (*R.M.*²
322), but was afterwards definitely abandoned by him. On the other hand,
L. Müller explains *sis* as a genuine synizesis form.

[1] On the other hand, of the seven necessary cases (inclusive of *Men.* 972) in
the drama of *dissyllabic* nom. pl. m. and abl. pl. of *is*, which are cited by Sturtevant,
l.l., 24, one is the fourth foot of the senarius, two are verse-closes, and four are
trisyllabic groups.

labic form like *ab-īs* was not permitted; similarly all the group-forms of *idem* were tetrasyllabic like *sĕd-ĕŏdem*, and a trisyllabic form was not allowed. In the same way we must explain the striking fact pointed out by Engelbrecht (*Wien. Stud.* VI, 236 ff.), that, while the simple verb *eo* and the compounds of *eo* with a long preposition show only the contract forms before *s*, *e.g.* *īsti* (*Tri.* 939), *īsse* (*ib.* 944), *exīssem* (*Ru.* 534),[1] yet, in the case of the compounds with a short preposition, the verse of the dramatists often requires and always admits the full forms with double *i*, *e.g.* *ăbĭisti*, *abiisse*, *abiissem*, *obiisti*, *subiisti*, *adiisti*, *rediisti*, *periisti*, *intĕrĭisti* ; cf. *adiese* and *adiesent* (*CIL.* I, 196, 7 f.) in the *S. C. de Bacchanalibus* of 186 B.C. This is the special peculiarity in the early treatment of these forms which Brock (*l.l.*, 78) seems to regard as inexplicable, and it is evident that in the second century B.C. the short *i* in hiatus of these forms was preserved from contraction by a psychological cause, that is, by the sense of logical analogy. The perfect of the simple verb is inflected *iī*, *īsti*, *iit*, and thus a single short is lost by contraction before *s*; *a pair of shorts*, however, has become closely associated in the Roman mind with the perfect forms *ăbĭi, ăbĭisti, ăbĭit*, etc., and, in view of this strong association, the loss of one of the pair, as in the contract form *abīsti*, would make the form seem incongruous, and would seriously obscure its connection with the remaining forms of the perfect. Therefore logical analogy forbids the usual contraction to take place, or, to speak more accurately and to adopt the language which is suggested by Exon's admirable discussion of similar linguistic processes (*Hermathena*, XIII, 145 ff.), the contraction actually takes place, and the incongruous form *interīsti* is produced, but the sense of analogy immediately awakes, and a 'special sound-law' arises, in virtue of which *i* is retained before *is*, after a short prefix, as in *interĭisti* (*interieisti, CIL.* I, 1202).[2] 'Special sound-laws,' however, often find special difficulty in maintaining themselves

---

[1] The only exception is *vēniisse* (*St.* 232 ; *Ps.* 1090), which should perhaps be written *venivisse*.

[2] Cf. also, for the quantity of the second *i*, Marx, *Hülfsbüchlein f. Ausspr.*[8] 10.

fully, and forms like *abiïsti, abiissem,* which were doubtless in exclusive use in the second century B.C., were compelled, in the following century, to yield a portion of their territory.[1] It should be added that this rhythmical epenthesis, this tendency to retain *i,* exists in a less degree in all verbs beginning with a short syllable, notably in *petiisti* (cf. Verg. *Aen.* ii, 25 nos abiisse rati et vento petiisse Mycenas), but the great number of the compounds of *ire* with short prefix caused analogy to be most strongly felt, and uniformity to be longest maintained, within this single group.

(6) **Question of Synizesis in Verse-Closes.** — As we have already seen (pp. 165,195, n. 1), the principle of metrical regularity excludes a contract form like *m(e)ó* from the close of all verses which conclude with an iambus.[2] Similarly the contract dative *mi,* which, unlike *m(e)o,* is a perfect monosyllable, and occurs as such in all periods of the language (L. Müller, *R.M.*[2] 296), is allowed, so far as I am aware, only in verses which close with a trochee, *e.g. Mo.* 175 (troch. oct.); *ib.* 871 (bacch. tetr.). The exclusion of synizesis forms also from the close of verses which end with a trochee ($\angle\ \cup$) is easily understood (p. 179). Synizesis is not, however, necessarily excluded from verse-closes of the form $\_\ \angle$, and some certain examples are cited by Audouin (*l.l.,* 69, 121, 228) from the diaereses of anapaestic verse, in which a resolved thesis such as *tŭŏm* would be extremely unusual, *e.g. Ba.* 1153 (p. 179, n. 2); *ib.* 1157 nilí sum. istúc iam prídem sc(i)ó (cf. Klotz,
$$_{4}$$
Grundz. 210, n.); *ib.* 1086; etc. Several possible cases (uncritically arranged) are also cited by Audouin from full anap. verse-closes, the best supported of which is *Ci.* 700 híc concílium f(u)ít (marked corrupt in ed. min.). We
$$_{7}\qquad\qquad_{8}$$

---

[1] Cf. Neue, III[3], 435 ff., 465 ff., 472.

[2] I reach at this point the same conclusions as Ahlberg, *Procel.* I, 92, but on wholly different grounds. It should be noted also that Pl. does not allow the shortened forms *potin(e), viden(e)* at the end of verses which close with an iambus (Seyffert, *Berl. phil. Wochenschr.* XVIII, 1577), and Dz. in his critical note suspects the one case of this kind in Terence (*And.* 476); we find the shortened form, however, in verses which conclude with a trochee, *e.g. And.* 299 atque aúdin ?
$$_{7}$$

are warranted in concluding that the synizesis forms are as well attested in such hemistich-closes and even in such verse-closes as we have a right to expect in view of the difficulties attending the identification of anap. verse.[1] Whether the gen. sing. *rei* in *Men.* 764 (siét r(e)ì, bacch. tetr.) should be considered a case of synizesis in the close is very doubtful; the *gen. sing.* form is elsewhere always dissyllabic in Pl. (Maurenbrecher, *Hiat.* 156, n. 2; Leo, *Forsch.* 323 f.), but, in view of its monosyllabic use by Terence, it is by no means certain that it is an absolute dissyllable.[2]

(7) **Specimen Verses.** — I may quote finally several verses which will serve to illustrate the various usages discussed in this paper.   It will be observed that in general only metrical necessity or convenience leads to the employment of *mĕî, mĕô* within the verse:

Cap. 740 : Períc[u]lum vítae m(e)aé t(u)o stát perículó.
St. 540 :   Dǘ(ae) ĕrant, quási nunc m(e)aé sunt.   ĕ̆(ae) ĕrant
              d(u)óbus núptae frátribús.
Poe. 366 : Méus océllus, m(e)úm labéllum, méa salús, m(e)um
              sáviúm (*i.e.* s(u)áviúm).
Tri. 329 : Dé-mĕó : nam quód-tŭómst m(e)umst, ómne m(e)úmst
              autém tŭóm.
Cas. 614 : M(e)am istúc transíre uxórem ad úxorém tŭám.
Cap. 628 : F(u)ístin líber? ‖ Fǘ(i). ‖ Enim véro nón-fuít, nugás agít.

Summary. — The results of the present study may be summed up as follows : Precisely that sequence of syllables and that position of the accent which produces iambic shortening in the case of vowels separated by a consonant has

---

[1] Skutsch (Γέρας, 131) needlessly rejects *sc(i)o* in the hemistich-close quoted above. On the other hand, it does not seem quite certain that O. Lat. synizesis can occur in a full anap. verse-close, such as that of the anap. oct., where it would be due entirely to the metrical accent. In the close of a full sentence we do not expect *mos f(u)it*, but rather *f(u)it mós.*

[2] Acc. to Seyffert, *Stud. Pl.*, 25 f., only twice does gen. *rĕî* fill any other foot than the last, viz. *Ru.* 487 ; *Ad.* 644. It is therefore somewhat similar to *nihil*, which never fills a whole foot in Pl., and never fills any foot except the last in Ter. and the metrical inscrr. Both these examples are instructive in their bearing upon the free admission of *mĕô* in the verse-close, and its rare use elsewhere.

given rise to O. Lat. synizesis in the case of vowels which stand in hiatus. This synizesis does not occur in verse-closes, since it is excluded from some closes by the conventions of the verse, and from others by the accentual conditions. Definite metrical proof of the extent of synizesis is afforded by word-groups like *t(u)ám-rem*, which show almost invariably a species of pretonic syncope. Finally, synizesis occurs most frequently in proclitic and enclitic words like the possessive pronouns or the substantive verb, which usually have little appreciable accent of their own, but it is also freely admitted in the case of those words which possess the ordinary intensity of tone, because these latter are themselves often subordinated in the sentence and placed beside words of still greater force and weight.[1] From such beginnings as these, synizesis is free to develop even in the case of strongly accented words.[2]

[1] For a fuller discussion of this point, see the supplement to the present article in *Classical Philology*, II, No. 5.

[2] *Addenda:*

P. 168. — While synizesis is distinct from the hardening of *i* and *u* into full consonants, yet it is often the preliminary stage to such hardening and to the consequent loss of these sounds, cf. Corssen, II[2], 754 ; Stolz, Müller's *Handb.* II[3], 2, 32.

P. 194, n. 2. — See also especially Skutsch, *Forsch.* 136, n. 1.

P. 204, n. 2 (end). — Compare also O. Lat. *hibus* for *hīs*, *ībus* for *īs*.